DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 026 848

EM 000 325

By-McKenzie, Betty; And Others

Report of a Seminar on the NAEB. (University of Wisconsin, July 16-19, 1961).

National Association of Educational Broadcasters, Washington, D.C.

Spons Agency-Kellog (W.K.) Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.

Pub Date [61]

Note-114p.

Available from-The National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 1346 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($2.00).

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.80

Descriptors-Administrative Policy, Broadcast Industry, Educational Policy, *Educational Radio, *Educational Television, Financial Support, Information Services, International Organizations, *National Organizations, Networks, *Organizational Change, Planning, Policy Formation, Professional Associations, Professional Recognition, Professional Training, Public Relations, Radio, Research Needs, *Seminars, Shared Services, Speeches, Teacher Education, Television

Identifiers-NAEB, *National Association of Educational Broadcasters

The last of a series of seminars conducted by the National Association of Educational Broadcasters (NAEB) was planned to afford a penetrating look at the overall position of the Association. The seminar focused on the position of the NAEB in the field of education, as well as in relation to its own constituency, and attempted to evaluate the NAEB's past efforts and future goals. The keynote address offered challenges to the NAEB to accept its responsibility in dealing with the problems of our time, to develop a profession for educational electronics, and to function in the technical, production, legal, and administrative areas for the effective use of educational media. Twelve major types of activity were discussed in group sessions, and final reports were made on each area. These reports, covering: programs, professional advancement, teacher and educational development, member services, research activities, technical services, public relations, promotional development, policy direction, financial support, liaison with government, and international relations, are intended as guidelines for the administration of the NAEB, as well as for educators interested in the application of educational media. The seminar report contains the address, portions of the discussions, and the final reports on the 12 activity areas. (MT)

report of a seminar on the

NAEB

JULY 16-19, 1961
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

ED0 26848

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

report of a seminar on the NAEB

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTERS
WASHINGTON, D.C.

PRICE: $2

EDITED BY: SEMINAR PLANNING COMMITTEE
AND BETTY MCKENZIE

EM 000 325

preface

The growth of educational broadcasting and the expanded use of electronic media in all aspects of education have amplified the role of the NAEB in the general field of education and have increased its responsibilities. During the past ten years the NAEB has held some twenty-eight seminars to consider various phases of educational broadcasting ranging from script writing and video tape recording to program development and station management. This year's seminar was the last to be supported by the Kellogg Grant. It seemed appropriate that this last seminar should be devoted to a study of NAEB itself by its elected directors, professional staff, and members holding key assignments. This seminar was planned to afford a penetrating look at the overall position of NAEB in the general field of education as well as in relation to its constituency; to evaluate what the Association has been doing and relate it to that which needs to be done, and which can be done by NAEB. Twelve major areas of activity have been considered and detailed reports and recommendations have been drafted. From these findings it is expected that the Board of Directors will reconstruct and up-date Association policy and establish a schedule of priorities for activation of specific recommendations for the development of NAEB services and activities, and for the direction of its future course. It is hoped that this record of the deliberations of this last Kellogg seminar will help establish guide lines not only for the members of this Association, but for all those interested in the further development of the educational processes through the use of electronic media.

seminar planning committee

Robert Blakeley, State University of Iowa, Iowa City.

Vernon Bronson, Miami, Florida.

Larry Frymire, Michigan State University, East Lansing.

Harold E. Hill, NAEB administrative vice president.

Keith Nighbert, University of New Hampshire, Durham.

Edward Rosenheim, Jr., University of Chicago.

Harry J. Skornia, University of Illinois, Urbana.

Seminar Chairman: William G. Harley, NAEB president.

seminar procedure

The Seminar met first in general session, under the chairmanship of the President, in order to provide the group with background information relevant to the various areas of interest. The general session was followed by twelve group meetings in which specific study was made of the following major areas of activity of the NAEB:

1. Programs
2. Professional advancement
3. Teacher and educational development
4. Member services
5. Research activities
6. Technical services
7. Publicity and public relations
8. Promotional development and activation
9. Policy guidance and direction
10. Financial support
11. International relations
12. Liaison with all branches of government

Preliminary reports and recommendations, resulting from the group meetings, were made in general sessions which considered each item at length. The groups then met to incorporate recommended changes and refine their reports in light of these general discussion.

Final reports were brought back to the general session for further evaluation and acceptance.

An editorial committee, appointed earlier, reviewed the recorded discussions and related them to the final reports and recommendations of the Seminar.

contents

page

KEYNOTE ADDRESS – The NAEB's Role 1
Harry J. Skornia
Discussion 13

DISCUSSION OF TOPICS

Programs 25
Professional Advancement 35
Teacher and Educational Development 37
Member Services 39
Research Activities 43
Technical Services 45
Publicity and Public Relations 47
Promotional Development and Activation 49
Policy Guidance and Direction 53
International Relations 57

FINAL REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Programs 67
Professional Advancement 69
Teacher and Educational Development 73
Member Services 77
Research Activities 79
Technical Services 81
Publicity and Public Relations 83
Promotional Development and Activation 87
Policy Guidance and Direction 89
Financial Support 91
International Relations 93
Liaison with the Branches of Government 95

PARTICIPANTS 97

APPENDIX

General Background Information for 1961 Seminar 99
Professional Development Committee Paper 104
Letter to Seminar from Ned Rosenheim 107

Keynote Address

The NAEB's Role

Harry J. Skornia

I think there are a couple of dilemmas that we have to think over as we look at the job we're to do here.

One of them is the fact that we can't concern ourselves only with what our institutions and our stations do because we've got to concern ourselves with the over-all information and education job that is available in the country. And that is affected very greatly by what the commercial media do too; so we can't cease to take a look at and make contributions in that area.

The other one is the dilemma of an association like the NAEB in which we have ideas and we isolate a few problems. We articulate them and then we find that we can't carry them out. We see other people getting money to do these jobs in a way that we sometimes think isn't exactly the right way, reaping great reward and great credit for them, and we're inclined to be a little "dog-in-the-mangerish" about this, I think, and we sit on the sidelines and we protest and we kick and we raise the devil. I think that if the job is worth doing, we're going to have to realize that there is a certain altruistic role that we're bound to have to fulfill and that if the ideas get implemented, we've done a good job anyway. Any of you who have written articles or books or anything of that sort know that just about the time you get ready to set something down some other person comes up with the same idea.

So I'm going to start out briefly talking about what I think is the general media job that we're going to have to participate in generating in this country—the fact that the information on the basis of which decisions are made in this country comes to people very largely in terms of the mass media.

In spite of having enormous media machines Americans are constantly being surprised by such world events as the stoning of Nixon, the blow-up of the Paris summit, the Japanese dis-invitation to Eisenhower, Castro events, and all sorts of these things, all of which were pretty largely predictable and which small voices had already predicted. Reporters had sent reports to their newspapers. An example of that, I think, was the recent New York Times story on Haiti. It pointed out that Haiti was just on the brink of what Cuba has gone through and that it's only our money which is keeping tyrants in a position of power sitting on the powder keg and that unless we change our loan position and recognize that here is a revolution about to blow, we are going to be in precisely the same position that we are in Cuba. I've seen this in no other newspaper—and it was quarantined to such a small place in the New York Times even, that I'm afraid it illustrates a great many things that are being kept from the public in this country if those things seem to be frightening. I think we're going to have to lend our efforts as much as possible to getting access to these problems and begin to talk about pretty serious problems, whether they're the Castro ones or any other sort.

I think the picture we're being given is that everybody in the world ought to love us and it's the fault of the communists that they don't. And I think that this assumption is very false. I think that it gives the communists credit for a lot of things they don't deserve credit for. We're in the midst of a world revolution, and we'd better recognize the nature of it in Africa or elsewhere if we're going to help set up broadcasting systems and if we're going to play a responsible role; because if we play those roles irresponsibly, we can be doing as bad a job, as dangerous a job, as our enemies could do if they were trying to sabotage us.

Right after the Kennedy visit to Canada, Diefenbaker held a press conference to which several hundred reporters came. The May 25 Toronto Globe and Mail said that Prime Minister Diefenbaker had said bluntly that U.S. residents don't know enough about Canada and are inclined to take Canadians for granted. He stressed that Canada could not be expected automatically to accept the foreign policy and economic implications of the United States. The New York Times report of this press conference made no reference whatever to any indication that the Canadians were getting a little fed up with some of the American economic actions. In most of the best papers (and we checked the New York Times on through the Louisville Courier Journal and the St. Louis Post Dispatch and all the rest of them which had reporters there) we found no reference to it at all. I wonder at what point self-deception and ignorance become just as dangerous as brainwashing. I'm increasingly disturbed, as we look at some of these problems, by the absence of materials we get. George Gerbner at the University of Illinois did an analysis of the coverage of a couple of problems by a Hungarian newspaper behind the Iron Curtain and by the New York Times. As a matter of fact, he found that in coverage of many of the serious significant problems, there was far more treatment and far better treatment in the Hungarian Iron Curtain publication than there was in the New York Times. So in this whole journalistic free-access-to-information area, we should cease to be as smug as many of us think we have a right to be, I think, and we should ask ourselves if we can leave to the commercial media these jobs as much as I think many of us are leaving them—while we concentrate on in-school and other types of problems. That, I think, is one of the first problems we face; the need to participate in the general over-all media picture here and begin to break through in some areas.

Some of you remember the protests that came from your constituents at the time we did the Felix Green reports out of Communist China. In our suggested reply we pointed out that we regretted that we were not reinforcing smug self-satisfaction or wishful thinking, but that we felt an obligation to give news regardless of how unpalatable; that this man was a recognized journalist; that there was greater acceptance of his reports in Britain and in Canada and so forth, and that we found it a rather sad commentary on the state of American awareness of world problems that there should be that kind of concern registered here. In this country people shouldn't be shocked to hear of that sort of thing.

Over a billion people in areas of South America and Africa now receive the equivalent of $100 or less a year and are living what is essentially an animal existence. We overlook too much, I think, when we plan what to do in Africa, what to do in South America and so forth, and the presumptiveness of U.S. foreign policy in all too many cases is reinforced by an insularity on the part of American public opinion which must be changed. I think there's going to be continuing popular revolution in all countries irrespective of communism. If you wiped communism out, these countries still wouldn't want to be slaves of colonial powers; they want to rise to a position of enjoying all sorts of things.

Visualizing our role in connection with the print media, we have to consider what radio and television can do in the schools as compared to what textbook publishers can do — both because of the pressure that is brought to bear on textbook publishers to keep certain things out of books and because of timeliness. We have to consider what part of our role must be public affairs and news and other things which I know are rather hard to get, but which the NAEB has begun to be able to move into somewhat.

Television monopolizes more time, I think, than any other waking activity. Now, some people say "except work." I sat down with a pencil the other day and if I take out coffee breaks, I think that television viewing uses up more time than anything else in the United States. In January, 1961, 29,172,000 American families on an average were watching television. Two-thirds of the population seems always to be watching television in the evening at some time or another — taking flight from reality very largely, considering the programs they are watching or listening to. I think the first duty of the commercial media has been visualized as the pursuit of profits for itself. That isn't the announced policy, I agree. Their policy is the education of Americans to the consumership of advertised products and goods. The ultimate in satisfaction is individual, private pleasure. I won't get into the area of the public versus the private areas here; this has been discussed by various economists.

Lazarsfeld and Merton wrote thirteen years ago: "Since our commercially sponsored mass media promote a largely unthinking allegiance to our present social structure, they cannot be relied on to work for changes, even minor changes, in that structure." Now they were talking about television and radio at a time before they had come to swallow as large a proportion of the attention and time of the American public as they now do. So they made this in a fairly straight-forward, calm way. Yet the media now have replaced the town meeting; they have replaced so many things that they are now virtually the only available anvil on which to hammer out many of these changes. Three-quarters of television programing, 85% of radio, 75% of paperbacks, 75% of popular magazines are devoted to entertainment, not to any of the problems that I've been talking about.

One of the things I think that we have to take a look at also here is the nature of that entertainment, because entertainment isn't necessarily bad either. A Mickey Spillane type of violence for the sake of violence is technique stripped of content. In Shakespeare there can be just as much violence, but it's clothed in human meaning. It isn't violence for its own sake. And I think that when we talk about whether violence or whether entertainment is such and such, we often are just as bad as the defenders of it in the simplifications we engage in in thinking about it. Violence is not bad if it has significance. But if it is simply the titillation of the emotions along the lines of westerns and that sort of thing, then we are missing the point that obviously life does contain violence; it contains all sorts of powerful emotions, and there is a context in which art and beauty may also contain these things. You take them away and violence by itself — or entertainment, or the titillation of the ribs of the people — begins to cease to have significance or it begins to "narcotize," as some of the sociologists refer to it. It is minus the self-respecting meaning of love, for example, in the use of sex symbols. Conflict has come to be very important, but here everything becomes a contest or a game or competition. I think maybe this is one of the contributions of sports in this country. One thinks of sports as having certain significance within the athletic arena, but I think it has conditioned people always to look for a winner, and we visualize world problems in a sort of "technique and games" view in which every newspaper article has to show somebody slugging somebody and winning that particular round. And I'm not sure that it is force; I think very often that it is ideas which at the time don't quite come through which are winning the world struggle.

I think a couple of the mental blocks that we have have had ought to be thought about if we're going to take a look at new jobs which the NAEB might do. One of them is the lag between the implications of our physical situation and our present way of thinking. I think Walter Lippmann put it this way: "No American leader in the news, including Kennedy, has explained to the American people the new meaning of power and its changed distribution." It is fairly obvious, I think, that what he means is that it is not armaments, it is not the size of the country, it is the nature of ideas that is today the arena in which the struggle must take place, and that the American people are far too smug in their belief that they can sit on this powder keg with power, because that is not what is going to hold it down.

The other mental block is one I mentioned a little earlier — our failure to understand the nature of the world revolution, which is essentially for freedom from colonialism, freedom from colonialism versus the concept so many people have that the struggle is one against communism. I don't think the answer is free enterprise, which we're trying to spread all over the world. The colonies have had that; they had it under the British; they had it under the Spanish, the Dutch, the French and all the rest of them. It wasn't very satisfactory. They didn't have a very good standard of living; they didn't have very much satisfaction at all. The economic terms to which we reduced much of this, I think, are rather false.

Einstein, a long time ago, after the bomb had gone off (Incidentally there's a very good French book which was kept bottled up for years and finally came out in paperback, which I suggest you read. I can't remember the author of it; it was called The Bomb in its translation. It contains a good many of the Einstein documents, things that weren't previously published in the United States.) said, "We can only sound the alarm again and again. We must never relax our efforts to rouse in the peoples of the world and especially in their governments, an awareness of the unprecedented disaster which they're absolutely certain to bring on themselves unless there's a fundamental change in their attitude toward one another." And he's talking about democratic countries versus communist countries and versus all the rest of them. "The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything except our ways of thinking." The way people line up across the Iron Curtain or the Bamboo Curtain these days I think is a commentary on the willingness that the NAEB and all the rest of us are going to have to have to sit down at conference tables with people regardless of what countries they come from. Those of us who are still thinking in pre-1945 terms are going to have to change.

In this regard, I took a quotation out of Lewis Carroll because so many things we're taught these days by the commercial media remind me of this quotation. We hear on the media so many impossible things that we know are obviously false. Here's the quotation: " 'I can't believe that,' said Alice. 'Can't you?' the Queen said in a pitying tone. 'Try again. Draw a deep breath and shut your eyes.' Alice laughed. 'There's no use trying,' she said. 'One can't believe impossible things.' 'I dare say you haven't had much practice,' said the Queen. 'When I was your age, I always did it for a half-hour a day. Why, sometimes I believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast.' " She must have been listening to some of our newscasts.

Probably one of the things that people for thousands of years (looking forward to what we now have in the commercial media) thought we would have is the great conversation. It is requisite to democracy. We thought the new media would expand, not kill, the town meeting, the old city hall meeting, the meetings in school houses and churches and all the rest. Here was a new forum, yet the forum everywhere has been crowded off the stage pretty much by the fixtures of show business. Those of us here share the privilege of using electronic media to influence our citizens to adopt appropriate policies. And I think we can't simply say, "We're too small" or "Let the commercial media do it" or something else. I think we've got to exercise those roles.

I'd like to give one other quotation before I finish this particular section. It's from Parkinson who was on the campus at the University of Illinois about a year ago. He had a good way of explaining that the system of government that we now have, the economic system that we now have, is really nothing permanent. As you look back on what Rome had and Greece and Egypt and Byzantium and all the rest of them, what he tried to get across in his little economic lecture was that the present stage of the United States and its government in our free enterprise capitalistic system is really only a dot in the course of history, that it is wholly unlikely that it will last more than a certain period, and that the evidences of deterioration and change are already here. And he says that, viewed in the perspective of history, this is all virtually certain to happen. "There's no historical reason for supposing that our present systems – economic and political – are other than quite temporary expedients." I think that the mass media today have to be the arena in which we hammer out the changes that are to take place, and they are beginning to take place whether we like them or not.

To go on to a few of the more explicit aspects of the decision-making, I'd like to begin by quoting Eisenhower in his last speech as President: "We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence by the military-industrial complex." He had never said that until Kennedy was elected, although not yet inaugurated. But the fact that in his last speech he talked quite a bit about the same sort of thing that C. Wright Mills has talked about (in The Power Elite) indicates that Eisenhower himself believed that perhaps too much national policy was being made too much by the military and by the corporations into which retired military men moved as presidents and chairmen of boards. I thought it was significant that in his essentially last strong pronouncement he did make reference to this particular thing. This brings us into how policy-making and decision-making, take place. Who makes foreign policy? Who makes national policy? I'm not going to repeat some of the simplifications of The Power Elite, but I think there are large corporations and there are sharp rivalries, and I think places like the Center are not free from these kinds of pressures. I remember asking once how much the Center was going to do in the area of conservation. What were they going to do in the area of depletion of petroleum, or the depletion of metallic mineral resources? Admittedly, they're free to do anything they want; but they still get their money from Ford which directly or indirectly lives on the exhaustion of both petroleum and metallic mineral resources in this country. And although nobody tells you you can't do it, still there are certain little sensitivities that you are aware of and there are certain things that you are not going to do, I think. And they haven't done it yet.

There are large corporations and there are powerful rivalries. Much of the policy that is made today is made by leaks that are resorted to in advancing the policies of whoever makes the leak, whether it is the President's office with the skillfully placed news leak, whether it is a corporation, whether it is a labor union.

This reminds me of 1948 when I struggled a good deal with the organization of a news department for RIAS (Radio In The American Sector) in Berlin. The blockade was starting and our people were trying to set up a good news department that would cause the people to listen to RIAS instead of the much more powerful East Berlin station. And one of the things that I thought they were doing wrong and which we finally were able to put a stop to was that, good as our news department was, the communists were using us, or manipulating us. When one of the East German leaders, Grotewohl or someone else would speak, or when there would be an enormous rally in Leipzig, our newsmen would be real proud of the fact that they were able to cover it. And I said, "Don't you realize that in a great many cases these meetings are being staged precisely so you will cover them and report them? And that you're being used time after time? You've got to have the courage not to cover certain things which have propaganda implications, because unless you're extremely perceptive, you may be lending yourself to their nefarious ends."

And I think that in a great many cases we fail to recognize the extent to which things we relay are "managed" in some way or other by people who are a little bit more skillful than we are, and I think we are going to have to begin to screen more carefully ourselves everything that we put on. Here again, I don't exclude the Center and possibly even the NAEB in some cases. But we have to take a pretty good look at some of this stuff because much too often we may be reinforcing the status quo, or the corporate system, or a perhaps now-outmoded version of democracy that we shouldn't be holding onto so strongly, when we should be trying to promote dynamic change. And so it is perception of that type that I think we ought to be concerned with.

Vernon Bronson's paper (see appendix) lists a good many roles for the NAEB: Development of the general field of educational broadcasting into a discipline supported by a body of criteria, establishing broad national plans, etc. As he says, a long time ago I began talking about a national academy of broadcasting or even of educational broadcasting, if we had to call it that at first.

An academy is essentially, as the dictionary tells us, a society of learned men united to advance an art or science. A lot of you know that I started out as a teacher of languages, and in those days I was rather interested in the origin of the Academie Françaíse which was set up back in the 17th century. Following the invention of print, there was a great proliferation of the practice of writing. Every character who could speak or write was beginning to use the language. In France, after print, the language was being misused; the people who were concerned, the ministers of education and of culture, believed that somebody must take firm hold of the use of these media — the print media, the use of the language — and begin to draw up standards so that the language could be beautiful and responsive and responsible. This whole academy concept fits in, I think, rather well with the needs enunciated at the stage we're now at in the broadcast business. We've had years of seeing how these media can be used, and we find that in a great many cases misuses prevail: What is the meaning of a superlative any more? What is the meaning of language? Several people, like Thurber and Crosby, have said that they think our language has about "had it," that you no longer can tell what is meant by what is said. There, then, is a kind of media chaos which is similar to the linguistic chaos which the French academy was set up to meet.

And so the time is here, I think, for the setting of some standards and direction signs. Why should the NAEB begin to carry the ball on this? One of the reasons is a naturalness of the NAEB and its constituency as a foundation for this. Somewhere in this country there should be someone to initiate this effort. Let me read from W. W. Rostow about the role of American higher education in relation to developing areas, which appears in the Educational Record for July, 1961. He says: "At the present time, some nineteen agencies are running international education programs. These are only loosely coordinated in the Department of State. They concentrate excessively on the exchange of persons rather than on the building of institutions within the countries." He lists the various conflicts and he says, "We might consider creating the equivalent of a national science foundation in this international education area. Its task would not be merely to coordinate more effectively than at present the scattered government programs, not merely to relate government and nongovernment programs, but also to take responsibility for creating new educational institutions for the training of civil servants, agricultural extension workers, industrial managers and the like."

Relate this a little bit to the need for trained people in our field. For instance, there is the need for some sort of responsible handling of foreign scholars who come to this country. People have visited me; people have visited you, I'm sure, from Africa and elsewhere. We've done the best we could, but the chaotic way in which the picture is put together for them now is really a sabotage of the opportunity that is afforded this country by their visits.

Rostow is calling for essentially an academy in the international educational area, too. To go back again, France has seventeen academies. I haven't counted how many national academies there are in the United States, the American academy of this and the National academy of that; there are quite a number. The urgency of our need reminds me of the Manhattan Project of World War II. The Manhattan Project grew from a small idea at the University of Chicago with Einstein and Fermi. There were small meetings and little committee groups and there was the willingness of these people — it wasn't necessarily the University of Chicago after they got through — people who felt that the good of the country was greater than the good of any one institution. Suddenly a responsible group of influential scientists was brought together, who were able to implement that.

How do we proceed? We're going to have to do the same thing we did with reference to the Magnuson Bill; we're going to have to get together, and we're going to have to isolate someone, and Lenny Marks or someone is going to have to take a statement or document that we have. Then we're probably going to have to introduce legislation. We're going to have to try to create an academy.

Let's no longer continue to talk about getting Ford money or U.S. Office of Education money; all of us know the headaches most of those bring, and I'm not sure that we want attached to what we do the kinds of strings that those will be. Some of the strings of federal funds are less onorous, in many respects than grants, I think. And I think that during this kind of administration — you've seen the awareness of the Kennedy administration, the telegrams sent, the statements made, in many cases made with reference to organizations like ours, the NAEB, and others — this is the kind of climate we've been asking for in which to take this kind of step. So I hope sometime during the seminar we talk about how this thing can be put on the road, and we can begin to suggest and draft legislation necessary to get us moving.

I think that what we need then to do is to take the disorganized participation that the mass media mean today, and institutionalize these media in some way as communication instruments. We need to establish a center which will help the nation to implement the best possible uses of the electronic media on behalf of our country, and on behalf of humanity.

The role of a citizen in an age of electronic bombardment and fallout has to be considered with the utmost concern in relation to education, culture, and understanding. I have the profoundest faith in the potential of these instruments for good in the service of enlightenment, tolerance, and mankind. The hard thing about it is that this, too, is an altruistic job, and when we get through, the structure I think is needed may not be an NAEB academy. It is likely to be only one more thing that the NAEB helped create. And I expect that if it is the kind of organization we want, NAEB people will be involved, probably as individuals, but the NAEB may be involved only thus indirectly. It would be a wonderful home for the NAEB to be in such a framework, for example. But I don't think that we can let our own feeling that this should be NAEB's academy prevent us from recognizing the larger job that is needed, and trying to implement it. And I don't see very much in the way of immediate returns that it would bring the NAEB. This is the dilemma we so often confront.

In his speech last April, John Burns of RCA spoke about the need for two and a half billion dollars. I think a lot of what he's talking about could and must be done by the NAEB. I think he has given a challenge to the NAEB which we can't escape, and we're going to have to take a look at whether we're going to play in the kind of league he visualizes. We're going to have to decide at this seminar whether or not we're going to pick up the kind of challenge he gives us, whether in the framework of a national academy or not.

The next problem I want to discuss is the NAEB's role in creating a profession. In earlier remarks and in the many things that Vernon Bronson (who is probably the father of this whole concept) and I have articulated, we've talked about a professional home in this country for what will soon be, say, something on the order of 10,000 people in educational electronics, some of them teachers, some of them in broadcast positions, some in closed-circuit. I think we're going to have to think in terms of including commercial broadcasters as well, eventually, because I think the standards that I hope FCC Chairman Minow will bear down on will begin to make it desirable for even commercial broadcasters to belong to a professional society as part of their qualifications for engaging in broadcasting, whether it is in an educational station, a commercial station, or an agency. I think that membership in a national academy of science is not a bad qualification for a person working for GE, for example, and I don't think that membership in a first-class professional association like the NAEB will be a bad qualification for somebody working for NBC or one of the agencies.

All of you who take care of foreigners know how desperately they're looking for a professional home. I'm afraid they're likely to find it in some of the new efforts of the Soviets as they begin to expand their international broadcasting activities, unless we're able to come up with something which is equivalent to the professional home for these people on a world-wide basis. So I see the need for an international association of educational broadcasting as an association, if not an academy.

Let me illustrate. Suppose we start a little group in the Congo or in the Sudan or wherever we do it. We move in, we create a system, we move out. They say, now what do we do? Well, we send them the NAEB Journal; we send them a few other things. We leave these little groups in this island of broadcasting in the middle of Africa with no lifeline professionally to anything or anyone. We shall see little islands like this dry up, where there are not the roots, the professional lifeline, the professional pride and contacts that you have. And so I think this whole professional push is going to have to be part of our international effort as well as our national effort. I'm sure that if I were able to visit the stations of Munich and Frankfurt and Berlin and so on, that we could pick up probably several hundred members in a single country like Germany because of the very high professional qualifications of most of the members of the staffs, partly on the basis of the fact that when we were over there as occupying powers, we set up for broadcasting in those countries standards that are far higher than those which apply in this country. And I think that though it might take a little stumping of a few continents, a world-wide membership of perhaps 100,000 eventually is what we should be thinking of in this professional area.

We would have, in these people, "stringers" for programs, and contributors to and recipients of the Journal, for instance. It may be that we would not have as good an American magazine as we'd wish, but like the European Broadcasting Union Bulletin or some of the other magazines, it might be the best international magazine that is put out. Let's think about that role and distribution a little as part of the professional role of the NAEB.

I think there is no shortage of professionals in broadcasting in the United States today. But they're professionals in the wrong things. I think that card sharps are professionals, for example — professional card players; there's no question about it. But I have a feeling that a lot of the "pros" we have in broadcasting are pros in various other things. They are pros in sales or pros in advertising or pros in how to get around a person's moral or ethical objections. They are experts in subversion; and they are experts in the brutal uses of these media, but not in understanding what they are or what they do to people. And so there is a kind of professionalism now, that these people have. But I think that we don't need professionals in this kind of manipulation. I think that irresponsible psychiatrists are professionals, but I think that what distinguishes a good psychiatrist from this kind of quack is the presence of standards which means that there are certain things he won't do for money. As I've often said, this seems to be one of the most important characteristics of a profession. I think the present uses of these media, even by some of us, but principally in certain commercial uses — are probably a supreme example of cynicism, probably one of the greatest examples of cynicism that we have in our age. It's a situation which many of us, I think, are blind to because of our conditioning.

All over the world, television and radio people are looking for a professional home and looking for standards. They're looking for more responsible uses than the kinds that we are giving them examples of. I think in some cases we're going to have to take a look at some ideas that are so sticky and so hard to define that nobody else can implement them. And we're going to have to tie into them and make our educational or prestige fortune in that way.

I think that Chairman Minow has articulated some evidence of the fact that the FCC is about to use more of its legally constituted delegated power than in recent years. But anyone who has seen the resilient strength of industry in the past — in the forties, in the times when the Blue Book was being written and we also had hopes — to resist similar changes, knows that we cannot count on full success until we see evidence of what is being done.

The General Mills spokesman at last fall's FCC hearings gave as good an answer to Minow as any — with reference to what goes into their programs. Here is an excerpt: "Characters should reflect recognition and acceptance of the world situation in their thoughts and actions although in dealing with war, our writers should minimize the horror aspect." That single sentence, I think, reflects the directive given to their writers and producers: that you (as a writer or producer) will accept the economic and social situation as it is, including domination by the military and so forth, and that you will not indicate that war is undesirable, among other things. You may glorify it all you want but not the opposite. I think that we're up against a tendency to picture only that kind of reality which reinforces the status quo.

I think we ought to look at industry influence on education generally, as well as with reference to some of our grants. I saw an article recently which listed some of the ways in which industry influences education: scholarship programs which affect admissions; grants to departments; sponsorship of or paying for specific research; employment of professors as consultants and advisors; the hiring of graduates and in some cases sending them to school on the job; the making of contracts for special instruction which often result in the creation of new departments; the encouraging of continuing education and adult education programs; representatives of industry on boards of education and as trustees; and the same on boards of professional societies which set standards and accredit or fail to accredit the various activities, from teachers' licenses to professional standards in medicine and so forth. And so by affecting the standards, the salaries paid, the programs offered, the availability of teaching opportunities and so forth, industry has an influence on education already.

If you decide to list the effects of the government on education, I'm not sure that the lists of malicious influences that will be exerted by federal aid to education are any greater than some of these. I think we often say federal aid is bad, without asking whether other types of control may not be equally bad. I'm willing to take a look at all of these, but let's recognize the fact that there seem to be strings attached to nearly every kind of money you get, and that you have to think of the maximum freedom that you are going to have. Right now there are a lot of forgotten pressures that are already being exerted on us.

A Canadian publication, commenting on several techniques of research, recently said, referring partly to the McLuhan project, that there's too much studying of the stuffed mount instead of the bird in flight. And I think the way in which the FTC used to look at commercials on television by looking at the script illustrates this fallacy. Only recently did they finally stop doing that. Anyone who wants to know what the significance of the program is should know that you don't see it by looking at the script. Too often I think we're looking at some of these media in terms of what they look like in structure instead of at what their impact is with reference to content. The General Mills statement doesn't have reference to news because they sponsor no news. It has reference to everything else, and when you look at the pressures that infiltrate virtually every kind of entertainment and western and every other type of program, you find that there is an enormous area of unseen material that we're going to have to try to find some way to get.

The difference between the kind of professionals I've talked about and the kind of pressure industry talks about on one hand, and what we've got to do, lies in the emphasis on keeping channels open for the tapping and development of resources at all levels throughout the nation. In this respect I think there's a good deal of contrast between the NAEB and the Center, for example, and other large organizations. In larger organizations, the staff is pretty largely counted on for the ideas, and staff ideas are imposed to a far greater extent than has ever been true in the NAEB. A lot of those ideas are not necessarily the best ideas at all. I think some of the ideas that have been implemented with the most money have been some of the worst ideas, as a matter of fact. But, even worse, it gets us into the habit of saying, "Well, can we get money for it?" It gets us into a habit of acceptance which can well be fatal because we begin thinking only in terms of ideas that we can get money for. I think that there are ways of getting money after you've decided what you're going to do, and that we should let ideas have their head for a while. I don't think that an idea is necessarily good simply because it's supported by millions, and I think, as I say, that some of the most highly financed ideas can and may kill us just as dead as if they were foreign-invented.

I'd like to talk a bit more about publications. I wonder if we're missing the boat sometimes in thinking in terms of a printed journal in national terms, and whether we may not find ways to use our own media that print has not previously been able to do or that print isn't at the present time qualified to do. In other words, are we perhaps not thinking too much in terms of print media when we talk about publications? Should we not be thinking of some unique ways in which our own media could be used to do what print media have done simply because that has been the tradition? Maybe there are some new forms we can develop; maybe there are some new problems that are uniquely fitted to be done by our media. This reveals the double role of anyone in charge of publications — keeping in mind coordination between print and broadcast offerings.

Another need is that for production experimentation. Nobody to my knowledge in this country is engaging in experimentation in production, in production development. We need production development departments and experimentation. I think there is a very crucial need when I look around and see the lack of originality in production techniques...and some of the dullness. We've now got closed circuit; we've now got airplanes flying around; we've now got a good many stations; we've got radio and television. It reminds me a little of the statement you've heard me make that the only person in this country who is licensed in the broadcast business is the engineer. We insure that it'll hit you, but we don't pay enough attention to what is going to hit you. A good deal more can be done in this area, because here, too, we're putting every available type of instrument into operation to be sure that you're completely overwhelmed — that it rains down on you, that it hits you by line of sight, that it hits you through wires. I think we need to go back to an experimental approach and concern ourselves with production and selection a little more.

Then there's the technical field. I think that in the technical area we're going to have to include everything from satellite and stereo and networks and architectural layout to workshops for architects.

I think in the legal area we ought to sit down with Lenny Marks and take a look at whether we shouldn't be more positively rather than negatively oriented. But with the exception of our efforts on the Magnuson Bill, it seems to me that we're usually reacting rather than proposing. In this connection I hope that out of the frequency project we have the courage — if we think that a drastic shake-up is due in the frequency setup — to ask for what we really think we should have rather than compromising too much in terms and asking for too little. But here again if we're only reacting, or failing to be as courageous as we might be, we're not fulfilling the role that we are privileged to fill when we're in the position that most of us are in. Maybe there is some legislation that needs drafting with reference to rights or postage or various kinds of freedom from pressure. Maybe we should be thinking "All right, now, what would be an ideal situation with reference to the copyright situation on behalf of education? or union regulation with reference to education?" because too often we are dealing in terms of somebody else's common denominator. Instead of reacting to what others do, maybe a new, more positive role should be visualized for us in the legal area.

In the administrative area, I think it was Marshall McLuhan who said that organization charts are now out of date. I'm beginning to think they are. Any of you who have these problems know that decision-making and policy-making within an organization don't take place the way they used to take place. And so we perhaps ought to be familiarizing ourselves with people like Richard Meier and Peter Drucker and some of the new concepts of more flexible organization.

It seems to me that in an organization like the NAEB we have to examine who does what, or what kind of people we need in staff, consultant, and committee positions. When I was president, I was essentially a generalist. I was much too vague and general in the approach I had with the NAEB, in many respects. And then there was Harold Hill who could take all of these things and put them into effect. He's a doer type of person. I think there's room for both the dreamer and the doer on the NAEB staff. There's room for, say, a president, a chairman of the board; there is room for chairmen of committees. I just read the report of Ed Burrows of the network committee, and it's one of the most thrilling things I've read in a long time. I was impressed with the extent to which — now that he is chairman of this committee — when something needs editing and processing, he and the Michigan staff are doing it, much as WNYC did many years ago. What a single excellent committee chairman can do to step up an operation or a function is very, very thrilling. It is one of the strengths of the NAEB. Other examples are obvious in what Carl Menzer has done in and with his engineering committee. I could go on; I'm not intentionally leaving anyone out. But I was using these as examples of the tremendous contribution that an active and important committee — and energetic and creative committee chairmen — can do.

Then let's look at the role of our consultants. Are people like Marks or Novik or Emery or Jansky and Bailey implementers? Or are they consultants also with reference to policy? What are they? In a great many cases, we've used them as implementers, of course. But I'm not sure in all cases we're using our consultants in the best way we might. Perhaps at the policy level we've got to broaden the concept that we've had previously, with reference to the board as idea and policy originators. Maybe there are some other levels which should be involved here. If we move into the academy concept, of course, we're going to move out of NAEB circles as well, for policy and decision-making.

What John Burns said, I think some of you may remember I had tried to say for a number of years, except that I thought in terms only of relatively few millions of dollars. He's speaking, of course, in terms of two and a half billion dollars, and I'm glad he did. He can speak in those terms without being accused of being a dreamer much more easily than I could. And so I am glad that it was he who said what I thought. I think sometimes Jack White has been a good teacher to us in having the courage to go out and ask for ten million dollars or fifty million or a hundred million dollars. I think that's partly been wrong with some of the things we've done; we've been too modest in our visions.

I would like to say that I think that what this little group, the NAEB, has done in view of the pressure and the money available to others, as opposed to us, has been nothing less than miraculous. I think that the progress of the network this last year, for example, in the year when we almost didn't have it, has been nothing less than fantastic, and I'm not sure that some of the things we've done on the network this year aren't illustrations of services that have to be kept alive and that might be lost if we gave up the network or sold it or in some way disposed of it.

I think that the frequency study — I hope we'll have a little report on that before we're through — is one of the most important and significant things we've done. Through the fine efforts of Harley, Hill, Hull, Marks, Novik, Bronson and Len Press and others who have put their shoulders to the wheel this last year in the move to Washington, we have reached new heights. We must have the courage to look out on the plain with the resolution to move decisively.

In this first year that we moved to Washington, the NAEB has had the best year. I don't see any reason why this seminar shouldn't use this, our best year, as a platform from which to make the best plans we've ever come up with. I hope and believe that the document that comes out of this seminar will be a better document even than the fine ones that came out of the Allerton seminars.

DISCUSSION

COMMENT: You've certainly given us the kind of keynote we need to lead off our discussions, stimulating and provocative, and a good deal of concrete material on which to chew.

QUESTION: I wonder if we really have a very precise notion of your concept of a national academy. Would you fill us in a little more on just what your notion is?

ANSWER: I have a twenty-three page document which outlines the academy idea. Vernon Bronson has further refined it in his document.

We talked over this request with the Ford Foundation and with the Kellogg Foundation, both of which (at least the people at that time in the Ford Foundation) said they thought it was a wonderful idea. The turnover of personnel resulted in our getting no grant for this later on, but this document followed discussions with John Weiss and Lester Nelson in the Ford Foundation, and discussions with Dr. Emory Morris, the president, and Maurice Seay, the director of education, of the Kellogg Foundation. They urged us to try to put together the academy idea, as a convenient form in which to make a massive onslaught on our needs, and to define them a bit. This proposal was aimed at the establishment in our nation's capital of a national academy to meet those needs and provide those services to education which are not now provided and seem unlikely to be provided unless such an effort is promptly exerted.

I might read just a couple of passages:

"To establish a national office which will help the nation in its educational effort to command the support needed, to implement the best uses possible of broadcasting instruments for the nation's welfare and humanities, and to establish grass-root support for such an effort."

I talk here about what a visitor to the United States sees. If you go to France, you go into the Radio Diffusion Television Francaise. Here, centralized, in Paris, is the story of everything that takes place. Here are the outstanding scholars. Here are producers, writers, geniuses of all levels, right here in this single city, and much of it in this single building. If you go to Italy, the same thing. These are seriously oriented broadcasting systems, of course; they have no sales department; they have none of the departments that a U.S. commercial network has. But I thought that somehow a foreigner coming to this country — or a U.S. scholar — should have a central place that he could go to for a fairly complete picture of what these media are and can do.

"The role of an individual in an age of electronic bombardment and fallout must be considered with the profoundest concern with relation to education, culture, and understanding," I said in this document.

I don't know whether you got the point of my analogy with the Academy Francaise or not, but the fact is that these media have essentially become a language; they've become powerful without reference only to what they specifically say. Their conditioning effect is such that we ought to be taking a look at what they do to people. I think we'll never get the kind of research we really need unless we put it in this kind of framework. "The great array of uses so far attempted and being developed in education," I had said, "to say nothing of the uses by commerce, has so far developed largely with less basic research than is needed for a basis for a central, guiding philosophy."

I outlined a number of functions, everything from administration and research to production. Taking research as an example, I visualized a research director and assistant, a library, with secretarial staff, consultation fees, publications with world-wide distribution, research grants-in-aid for subcontracting to qualified institutions, national TV-radio research seminars, and so on. Including supplies and expenses and travel, this particular item ran to $194,000 a year. Professional development was the core of the idea. It included everything from helping to develop courses of study and policy for the training of people, to seminars. Let me give you a little detail on this:

We visualized a vice-president in charge of professional development, with adequate staff. The proposal included national seminars and workshops, consultants, preparation and printing and distribution of announcements and reports. And then I had a special two-year crash program written in here, aimed at the establishment of professional standards for educational broadcasters, particularly in the schools. At that time, I thought this was timely. This ran to $300,000.

You can see that I was not as lavish as Burns is, but I still had looked at this in relatively realistic terms in terms of budget; and we were visualizing several million dollars for this thing.

For publications, we visualized a director of publications, three separate editors for the journal, special reports, and for the newsletter and other publications. The annual budget for publications was $240,000 a year. This included everything from national seminars and authors' fees and photographers to artists and so forth.

We then listed a production-development department. I talked to you about my feeling that we ought to be doing something in the way of laboratory experimentation in new program formats, and the spreading of a tradition of experimentation. I think that we've gotten in education too much of the same thing that we've gotten in commerce, the spreading of a tradition of playing it safe, of not wasting time on something that the Center "won't take," or the NAEB won't take, or somebody else. Now I think that's a devil of a way to run a railroad, if we're really going to be the group in this country that is going to take a look at new ideas and that is going to give new geniuses and new talent a chance to find outlet and encouragement for the development of new ideas and techniques. And I think that's true whether it's in relation to composers or writers, or people in lighting or production, or any other area. Somewhere — I know you can't do it at a station operated on the kind of financial basis they so often are — there should be some money for experimentation so that you could be helped to pick up some of the geniuses or crackpots whom we now only repress.

I outlined also a legal department — I talked to you about that. I fear that this situation is a tragic one today. Too often we watch American Telephone and Telegraph, for example, dominate representation on behalf of the United States. It's become too often the official voice of the United States at international conferences. You have everything sifted and coming up through official channels from France and Italy and Switzerland. But who represents us? Whichever corporation grabbed the ball on that particular thing. I think it's a great tragedy and a great mistake that that kind of representation is going on on behalf of the United States. I visualize trying to get the control back into an organization which would give a voice to the people and the nation — which would put this thing back into what I consider the kind of focus and the hands we need.

The engineering department visualized would concern itself with everything from architectural planning and layouts and publications, to depth studies of the international and space areas which are essential if we're to be remembered in allocations and so forth. Here I had listed $159,000 a year.

In the international relations department I had a $100,000-a-year budget which would now have to be increased because this is the area that has grown most since the time when the academy "dream" was drafted.

Then, I had a capital item of close to $2,000,000. "The establishment of such a Center," I said, "would require capital outlay for a building which would serve as a permanent national office in the nation's capital. Space would be provided, if possible, for Washington offices for the NETRC, the LRI, the other active users of TV and radio in education." And so I listed a new building at an estimated capital cost of $1,500,000 at that time; it would be much more now because this is not a new document.

I felt the NAEB was the natural organization to try to implement this proposal, as opposed to some of the so-called national "academies" that are now beginning, as the NAEB has no central organization whose interests it promotes. In the NAEB we try to keep the channels open for the tapping and development of resources at all levels throughout the nation. This is the enabling and facilitating role of the NAEB — to assist its constituent members and other learned and professional associations and colleague groups to realize their potential in education in an electronic age.

Does that give you an outline of what we proposed? Does anyone have further questions?

QUESTION: I'm a little confused. Sometimes I get the idea that you talk of the academy as something the NAEB should be active in implementing, developing, or putting into effect; and in another instance I get the idea that in a sense the NAEB would *be* the academy. And I think there is a difference. What is the picture here?

ANSWER: At the time this document was drafted, four years ago, I had in mind the NAEB's *being* the academy. More recently I have felt the NAEB perhaps cannot itself be the academy, but if it cannot, it should still promote it. It can perhaps only be a prime mover in the establishment and creation of an academy. Perhaps it would be the most important of the organizations housed in the academy building which I visualize as housing such groups. But I don't think the NAEB can insist on dominating it; I think all we can do is say this job needs doing; we're going to help all we can.

QUESTION: You point out the French and the Italian broadcast organizations and so on; you didn't mention Germany, but here's a clear-cut case where this is split up into seven or eight different organizations. Also the French and Italian cases you mentioned are clear-cut functions of government, aren't they? Do you see what I'm getting at here? One, we are not a single federalist nation in thinking, dictation, and so on. This would have to be faced in this type of academy. Two, whether it is a function of government or a function of industry or what. I know they have an academy in the motion picture industry and it is working there, but that is almost a regional thing. The motion picture industry is regionalized.

ANSWER: Probably my examples might have been better chosen if we talked just about Britain or Canada. In the case of the German Federal Republic, the problem we had there, of course, was the fact that we had a central, national system, and after the war we were resolved that that was partly what lent itself to Nazism. Therefore, Germany, in view of the temperament of the people of Germany, needed to have special precautions taken so that there would be no connection whatever between each state's broadcast system and any other. Each state had its own system. It was essentially states' rights dominance as opposed to federal domination. But this hasn't prevented the growth of high professional goals and qualifications. I'm not recommending that such an academy, or the NAEB, become a function of government. But it does seem to me that with all the stations there are and all the operations there are, they might like to have representation on their behalf better than that now available. And the image of U.S. educational broadcasting itself would also greatly benefit. Even though realistically I realize that it might not be the NAEB which would be or run such an academy, I do think the NAEB philosophy is the valid philosophy for it.

QUESTION: Is the membership in this academy to be composed primarily of individuals who have made outstanding contributions in some form of creative activity in the medium, research, technical, and so forth? In other words is it to be somewhat comparable to the man who is an outstanding research biologist or physicist, and so forth? Is this membership a professional membership of distinction of this type, primarily by election or by earning one's way in or something of this kind?

ANSWER: I'm not entirely clear in my own mind, because as I looked at the way in which several different American or national academies were organized, I found they differed greatly. In some cases, academies are essentially institutional in representation. I suppose members of the NAEB would qualify for academy recognition. But the academy is not in all respects the Association — and it is the latter which would set these criteria as I now see it. I must confess that I haven't thought about the crossover of membership between the NAEB and the academy or precisely how that membership would be constituted.

COMMENT: I believe the question here is to what degree would such an academy be able to realize some of the objectives of the NAEB which you indicated in the first part of your speech were critical in terms of today's society. I think the organization or structure or the kind of machine you build would have to be in terms of its capacity or ability to do a job in an area that's not now actively serviced.

ANSWER: This document is phrased in terms of the NAEB going out and getting a few million dollars, looking all over the country for the best director of research, the best person to develop professional development, and so on — whether from education or psychology or philosophy, no matter where. And that was going to be the NAEB's job. Maybe that's still valid; I don't know. But I have a feeling in view of the growth of other organizations that maybe it would be wise to have a few of their offices as well within this structure, so that one person could visit one place for a picture of educational broadcasting.

COMMENT: I've read the academy document many dozens of times. I think that maybe we're possibly confusing this academy idea as a conservator of ideals and as a promoter of ideals with the area of action that was originally planned. We sat down in another meeting such as this, perhaps in a couple of other meetings such as this, and arrived at some conclusions regarding the services that would be the things that would be needed to be done. And I think that out of those conclusions, out of the determinations of certain obvious needs that were not being served by any other organization — or if they were being served were being served poorly — and in light of the ideals of the NAEB, this document has presented a blueprint for performing those services. And it seems to me that they are still valid. We can't arrive at the establishment of an academy that confers honors until we have at least set up a kind of action situation that would give us or whatever we might establish the right to confer honors.

ANSWER: Originally I had used the same initials, NAEB—for National Academy of Educational Broadcasting—with the idea that maybe someday it would be the National Academy of Broadcasting, if we filled a need adequately.

Regarding the action in the proposal, I spoke of a Manhattan-type push because I thought the need was so urgent, because foundation grants were sometimes going to the creation of forces and powers that were frequently opposed to each other. And I thought the clash of various giants, sometimes disregarding the interests of education and the American public, was most unfortunate. So there needed to be someone to step into this vacuum before it was too late. That was why I talked about the Manhattan-type project. I still believe that that would have been a better thing than what has since happened, of course. I don't think it is too late, though the plan would have to be modified in terms of some of the power structures and the changes that have now occurred.

QUESTION: I believe the question here is not so much should this be done, but should we do it?

ANSWER: It's the same question we asked before. At least one of the organizations that recommended the creation of what is now the Center was the NAEB, the NAEB board. Well, then it came into being, and there are very few people from the NAEB in positions of control in it. And this, as I told you, is a dilemma. I'm really too much of an idealist, I guess, because I think that if a fine organization or project gets implemented and not a member of the NAEB is in it, that it's still good if the right kind of implementation takes place. I can't quite conceive of that happening here because I think that enough people within the NAEB are beginning to be the best people, so I don't think the NAEB would be left.

COMMENT: But certainly this will take a major chunk of energy in time, effort direction, thinking, the whole business. And in a sense, this wouldn't be one of the things we ought to think of the NAEB doing in the future. This almost becomes the thing; it's going to become our whole life.

ANSWER: It might become the umbrella for the restructuring of the NAEB. In other words, we ought to decide here whether we'd ought to waste our time thinking about this, because if we do think about it, then it's going to affect everything else we say and do in the document that comes out of this seminar.

COMMENT:

I would like to make one comment further on what was suggested about NAEB perhaps being the sponsoring unit of such a national academy because maybe the idea had grown beyond domination by the NAEB. Two thoughts come to mind.

First, in our Chicago meeting, (which was very similar to this, a meeting to determine the future course of the organization), it was I think fairly unanimously agreed that if the NAEB needed to be changed into something else, or even dissolved, in order to accomplish the welfare of the whole, this was all right; there was nothing sacred about the organization per se as long as the idea was advanced.

Then, in looking back over the organizations and the efforts that the NAEB has generated, and at the particular situations existing today in all of the professional organizations (even the American Medical Association as an example), either this idea — and what it stands for in whatever detail is carried forward — is dominated by the NAEB or the type of membership ideals the NAEB has, or it will be dominated by some other organization. We've got to be realistic about this thing. I think the time has come when there's no use for us to say, "Well, we generated this idea, but some of the ideals with which we generated it have been subverted." I think if we're going to prevent that in the future, if the NAEB is going to fulfill its function, then we've got to realistically say, "All right, this is our idea and these are the ideals to which we subscribe." We invite participation and we invite cooperation, but this is it — instead of turning it over and letting someone else change it or subvert it or completely recharacterize it.

COMMENT:

It seems to me that if we took away the notion of an academy and substituted for it the idea of a set of objectives for NAEB, the document we were briefed on would serve quite satisfactorily as NAEB's objectives whether an academy or not. I think there are certain things it would be difficult for NAEB to do, such as supply a professional home for a noneducational broadcaster. Perhaps an academy is much more suited to that, or to giving national awards or setting up standards of excellence for broadcasting, with those who met them, say a network or a station, being recognized by the academy. I think certain goals of the NAEB might very well be served better by an academy than by the NAEB. But in general, I think these are NAEB principles and objectives. My own concept of NAEB is as an absolutely essential tool to serve local broadcasters. Educational broadcasting in this country today is a large collection of separate entities, with each station, whether radio or television, serving a particular institution. Obviously we need a national association such as the NAEB to help each of us do a very much better job. So I think, in general, that these worthwhile objectives would perhaps be much better off in NAEB hands, because whatever is done at this national level can only find implementation at the local level of all the various stations that make up the NAEB. And therefore, this institution — whatever it is, whether it's NAEB or the academy — must be highly responsible to the individual collective membership that make up the academy or the NAEB. And I think, generally speaking, that maybe the academy idea as outlined here is a little too big; maybe two-thirds of it should be carried out by NAEB and perhaps part of it splintered off and set up separately as an academy sponsored by NAEB, bringing in a lot of other people as helpers.

COMMENT: I'd like to ask you to react to any suggestion about legislation here as a new approach because I think we've been so undramatic about this thing before that we've failed to move partly because we've kept our light too much under a bushel.

Suppose now, we were to go back and get together with Lenny Marks and Newton Minow, and possibly Leroy Collins and some other people, and begin to look at this concept or idea. I wonder if the FCC, for example, wouldn't find this an unofficial tool for standard setting — the sort of thing that would begin to define public interest, convenience, and necessity. And so we might begin to get into what are either legislative channels or are close to legislative channels in these next few years. At least I hope we don't take it back and put it back in the file and say we're going to have to do some more work on it before we unveil it, because I think we've got to make a start on implementing it, even if under another name or bit by bit.

COMMENT: I think the first thing we've got to do is to get the ideas: Where do we want to go? What do we want to do? And once these things are spelled out, then either we've got the brainpower or we haven't got the brainpower to organize and manage it. And whether this turns out to be an NAEB or an academy or an international association or an amalgamation or a labor union or whatever it has to be to get the job done, then let's do it. But at this stage of the game, we're worried about the mechanics and don't have any meat to put on these bones. There is only one reason why the academy idea has not gone through in the past. That is that we did not have enough facts; we did not have enough real, genuine ideas to carry this thing through. We have a lot of beautiful sentiment and maybe even some germs of ideas, but these haven't really been thought through. We've suddenly decided here there are a whole lot of things that need to be done, and one way to get them done in one fell swoop is to put them over into an organization. Nuts! I think we can get this thing done if we will decide what these ideas are, what the basic concepts are that we want to go through with, and then develop the mechanics to get them done.

COMMENT: It seems to me in deciding what our goals ought to be that we ought to back up even farther and to remember that NAEB has been and ought to appear to be largely a member organization with institutional and individual members. We ought, therefore, to give a good deal of thought to what the individual member can get out of and contribute to such an organization. This is what is going to make people join and determine the strength and quality and number of people who join. And I think we often rely on brute pressures to get people to join; we aren't really thinking through what kind of service we can give to them and, in turn, what kind of service they can give to the profession as a whole. I would like to see us analyze the problem in terms of the individual member, and what he will get and what he will contribute.

COMMENT: You have to turn this thing all the rest of the way around, it seems to me; I don't think we need to mount any glorified membership campaign. Let's make people want to join us.

COMMENT: The question I'm asking is why should anyone want to join us?

COMMENT: Our greatest problem in the NAEB is lack of internal communication. Too often we don't know what's going on. This is one we've really got to hit. As I heard one member put it: "I feel lost. Nobody tells me what is going on in the NAEB anymore. I do not understand what is going on in the NAEB anymore." This thread comes through all the mail that I have been getting lately. Person after person after person, obviously I couldn't tell how many, say, "Why aren't we told?"

COMMENT: It seems to me that the question of the academy is really a thirteenth item on this list of twelve which was presented in advance. Granted that basically it's a good one, there are so many others that it seems to me it's just another item on the agenda.

COMMENT: What does educational broadcasting mean? What are the things that need to be done to add to the understanding of the world populace of where we are and where we should be going? If we start from this concept, and then ask ourselves what the mass media can do — and only after we determine this, can we decide whether NAEB does this or another association does it or we go out and create another gadget to get it done. If then NAEB is going to study and continue to rehash what it has done and what in its structure it can do, then we aren't going to get anywhere. But if we can turn this thing around where we're thinking in the broadest possible terms of what needs to be done and then how we will get it done, I think we'll put the thing in the proper perspective.

COMMENT: I think I can go along with you there up to the point where you broaden your terms too greatly. There are a lot of specific things going on that changed the whole character of this business as a profession in the past few years, and it is going to change even more in the years just ahead. To determine the things you're talking about should be the basis for our future determination of a course of action or what role we want to play in this. We've got to look at these specifics. We do know — and maybe now is just as good a time as any to get at the heart of the matter — we do know, for instance, that the Ford Foundation with its specific programs of "research" has altered to a great degree the course of educational use of these media. There's no doubt that government is planning to have a much larger impact upon the educational use of the media. And certainly the corporate interests have made public their evidence of doing something far more than they've ever done before. Now, if we could consider these things specifically and in light of the ideals that we may have as professionals, broadcasters and educators, then I think we can get somewhere. But if we just talk about world-wide dissemination of ideas and news, and this side or the other, I think we'll be right back where we started from. We've got to get specific about the kinds of things that are occurring that ought not to occur.

COMMENT: It seems to me that the NAEB is now doing a number of things, some of which are being done well, others of which could be done better. If any discussion of the "academy" would assist in implementing the directions that NAEB is already taking in certain areas, I'm for it. However, if it means simply putting aside all of the minor problems and developments already under way to consider something new which has no relation to present problems, then I'm not for it.

COMMENT: Since we're looking at the problem of getting down into this uncharted sea, put a little Masefield into it, and I take it that what we're looking for is a tall ship and a star to steer by. The NAEB being the tall ship, this is something that we're attempting to build, to outfit to sail the sea.

But I think first of all we've got to set some kind of star. In other words, we've got to make a decision as to what the star is that we're going to steer the ship by. And within this framework, Edgar Dale had an article in his newsletter recently in relationship to the most productive learning environment in terms of the individual, perhaps that period of early childhood when his entire existence constitutes an environment in which learning takes place most rapidly and most effectively. It seems to me that when we talk about purposes and objectives of educational broadcasting, what we perhaps should think about in relationship to this star, to the total objective, is a kind of learning environment. The school represents one form of learning environment and so do the home and the church and other related agencies — but just the totality of existence is a learning environment. But within this, you have certain agencies and organizations and conditions which can contribute significantly and effectively in this environment.

I think part of our problem stems from the fact that as far as the media are concerned, we all recognize this environmental influence and impact that they have — the kind of viewing and listening and reading that is going on, the number of families, the amount of time, the number of hours, the levels at which people become involved from pre-school on up to old age. Somewhere within this framework we feel that the media are not presenting what we as educators feel is perhaps a necessary learning environment; and perhaps the objective of the educational broadcaster should be to provide through the media this kind of environment. Within this framework, we could give scope to the direct instructional program as well as to the broad, general, public-informational type of programing. The totality of the thing would represent a constant environment for the dissemination of information and the acquisition of information, for the establishment of principles, for judgment, for the establishment of values. In a total sense then, the educational use of the media could be pointed in this direction. And if we look at that, more or less, as the total objective, and within this framework, then perhaps we can begin to think constructively of the NAEB and its stations, its program services, its publications, it functions, and its activities in terms of how they most effectively bring about this kind of environment. What is it that the NAEB is attempting to do in terms of the big, long-range purpose and objective? What are the methods and means of building an organization to help achieve this purpose?

QUESTION: I'd like to have you amplify a little your thinking on this subject of influence. You've used the word a number of times — the influence of the organization, and I presume you mean upon the general public. How do you see this influence acting and actually determining public opinion? And if you are going to determine public opinion, does this mean that the NAEB takes certain stands?

ANSWER: I think we've been far too timid in the introduction of legislation, in working with government agencies, in working with certain other government or private organizations. I feel that we've reached the stage and we've reached the recognition so that often we can wield a lot more influence than we've had the guts to try to wield in the past.

QUESTION: Isn't there a thought that these things should be considered in terms of broadcast functions, functions of stations, while we are at the same time rapidly becoming an organization of individuals? Isn't there some conflict in orienting thinking toward station membership or station services as opposed to professional services to the individual, whatever these services may be?

ANSWER: In the past the network as such has had no particular goals as far as influence is concerned. This has been almost an accidental thing, depending upon what has been offered to it by member stations. Generally speaking, in the past, I would have taken the attitude that we present all sides to problems like disarmament. In the future, will the NAEB as an organization perhaps take a stand on an issue like this and thereby prohibit some individuals from appearing on one of its programs? The minute you take a stand on something, then somebody has got to make a decision. Even if you present this man, you're going to put on a disqualifier or something, if your organization does not agree with his point of view.

COMMENT: Of course, I think the answer to that is that this organization, as an organization, shouldn't try to influence people. I think that it should tend to influence standards of values, and there is a great deal of difference in this. Influencing people means point of view, means specific interest. Standards of value certainly would insure that conflicting viewpoints would be available.

COMMENT: I don't think it's our responsibility to take up a cudgel for the minority point of view just because it isn't being heard in opposition to a majority point of view. I don't think it's our responsibility as an association of stations and people to start out to try and influence people's judgments. I think that we give people the opportunity to form judgments, but I don't think we try and influence them.

Discussion of Topics

Programs

Discussion

REPORT: The network acceptance committee was revised as of February of this year, and a number of people were added to the committee so it stands now at twelve plus the chairman. This has some advantages in that a wider range of personalities and backgrounds will be involved in judging, and more material, presumably, can be judged. As it turns out, at the moment I believe some 45 program series have been judged since February by this committee of 13 people, an average of six or seven for each person on the committee.

About three months ago, the network was down to a new low of offerings. There was great doubt that we would have enough material to put together for a summer offering, let alone for fall, aside from a few stand-by programs that have been sitting on the shelf for many months. Since that time, the offerings have been coming in thick and fast to where we have a real problem on our hands, deciding what is going to be offered in the fall. We have so much that we think is good, that has been approved by the committee, and it's still coming in. I think it's a very healthy situation that we have more than we know what to do with right at the moment. And we're still in the process of locating new material, not only from the members but from outside sources as well.

We began this summer a trial period for a 5-minute program. We're now sending out three 5-minute programs a week on a single tape.

We started two series last March, based principally on materials from Washington. One is a 15-minute show that Len Press organized and set up and which is continuing. The other category of program from Washington is the special of the week, which is not specifically labeled as a Washington program, though it was the intent from the beginning that the majority of the material offered on that would be from Washington. When it is not available from Washington, or when something particularly good in the half-hour category comes through from a member station, we try to get it in. To date, some twenty-five of these specials of the week are ready. There is actually more material than we know what to do with coming through now for that particular series. The majority of these programs have been based on talks given at the National Press Club in Washington. These are reported on in the daily papers but seldom in any detail and they are almost invariably excellent speeches. The President and the Vice-President, the Secretary of the State, almost every member of the Cabinet to date, Edward R. Murrow, and others of similar capacity in Washington have all been on the specials. We've had half a dozen visiting heads of state, and representatives of foreign countries and a number of other shorter interviews dealing with almost all the major areas of the world, parts of two programs dealing with Laos, two programs dealing with African affairs and with Asian affairs. So, generally speaking, I think the balance has been good. It's too early to know what kind of reaction we're going to get from network members on the use of these things, whether they feel they're too timely in some cases or whether they're getting them on soon enough. We've tried very hard, if something is particularly timely, to get it right out in preference to something that is less timely.

In addition to these new programs and general inauguration of ideas, a side product has been the number of organizations that have come to us offering to contribute materials. The committee members individually are on the lookout for special materials; and the most recent example of this is one of those happenstance things that I think benefits us all: Don Quayle talked with somebody at the Cleveland Orchestra who offered to do a program on the anniversary of the death of Arnold Schonberg. Don notified me of the probability of this. I contacted the man myself; he did the program, the first copy of which went to Quayle in Boston to preserve his rights in the thing, and the second copy went out immediately to the network as a special. It was in everybody's hands in time to actually be played on the anniversary of his death. This sort of thing is developing. I think it is a good tendency.

In addition to this type of domestic programing, a number of other things have come up to which I'd like to call your attention. Many foreign sources have come to us, rather than our seeking them out. There are two in particular that I'm most interested in at the moment. The American Academy in Rome for a number of years has been working with Italian radio in the preparation of materials which they use at the Academy, which the Academy produces for use on the Italian radio. One of the members of our staff is in Rome right now and visiting with the director of the American Academy and I hope that something will come out of this that we may be able to get on the network by next year.

Many of you probably met Mr. Acda, representing the Radio Netherlands, when he was in this country. He spent some time with Bill Harley in Washington, other people in New York, and visited with me in Ann Arbor. Out of these conversations has come an experiment on the part of Radio Netherlands to do a weekly news commentary program. They are now broadcasting this program on two different wave lengths on Friday afternoon. The first full-fledged experimental show was a week ago Friday and came off quite well. I think we ought to have at least 75 per cent luck with that particular frequency and time. To provide coverage in instances like this, Radio Netherlands will be shipping tapes to us of an untimely nature in case we do not get a direct broadcast. This is still in a very experimental stage. We want to work on it for the rest of the summer, and the committee is now in the process of judging the first program which we received, both as to whether we think it's good or not, and also if they have any wishes as far as content is concerned. Radio Netherlands seems to be quite willing to work with NAEB to tailor this particular show for our use. There are two ways in which it can be used by the stations picking it up direct if they have trouble using the equipment; and this information will be published and publicized and/or it will be distributed on tape to those who would like to receive it that way. And I have hopes that it will not be so timely that we can't get it out within a ten-day period and it will still be interesting and different.

There are other contacts that we are in the process of making with European broadcasters, and we are working with the Eastern Regional Network on the Canadian exchange of programs. Many of these are in the developmental state, but it's wonderful stuff, excellent lectures by topnotch people.

COMMENT: Just as an instance of the happy circumstance of being in Washington, there was a call from Barry Zorthian and John Wiggin to come over to the Voice of America. They wanted to have lunch and talk about some things. And they said they had just got a ruling that the Dvorak amendment, which had for so many years intimidated them in making available any of their activities in the domestic market, had indicated that they might do this now. They had a problem; they didn't know how they were going to distribute this. Would NAEB be interested in doing it for them? And we, as soon as we saw what they had available, saw that this was a tremendous thing, and offered very distinctive kinds of programs with outstanding people that we couldn't normally make available. We submitted sample programs, and the network committee thought this was good, and we've got this moved into the distribution plan. But out of this has grown an amazing amount of cooperation whereby they are now recording for us almost anything of national interest that we want.

COMMENT: Some years ago the Voice of America began making a series of films for overseas distribution. At that time we were told that these were unavailable for us. I've seen a good number of these films and I'm sure many of them would be very suitable for showing on educational television stations, and I would like to see someone investigate the possibility of making these available for domestic TV.

ANSWER: I don't see why. If they're doing it in radio they are using the same principle; they ought to be able to make them available.

COMMENT: I'd like to make just one comment on the BFA business, because this has always been a question in everybody's mind: Should NAEB stay out of the international field? Are we stepping on BFA's toes? Are we going into competition in the international field? I have a feeling, particularly since I have looked into a number of these situations, that there are areas in foreign broadcasting that either BFA is not attempting to exploit or is not willing to exploit, that we can. And I can give you just a brief example of this with Radio Finland. BFA has distributed, as you know, festival after festival, including programs from Sweden and other Scandinavian countries. Now, we made a proposal to Radio Finland that they not send us the same sort of material that they were supplying to BFA, but that they send us specific material which we were requesting in order to build programs about Finnish composers and Finnish music, in much the same way that WUOM did a couple of years ago with the history of Swedish music. At the moment BFA is not going after that type of material in order to package programs. As you know, most of it comes in the quite unpackaged form. But this is something NAEB can do — obtain foreign materials and package them and put them into the form most palatable to our listeners. In this sense, I don't think anything we have done so far in any way duplicates what BFA is doing or in any way steps on their toes.

COMMENT: I frankly couldn't care less whether we step on the BFA's toes. That is, I think we were there first, and I think actually we're doing a better job. We shouldn't be distracted by "American Academies" and all the proliferation of organizations around here instead of keeping our eye on the ball and saying, "Nope, we don't care. You go right ahead and do it; we're going to do this and this and this." In some instances, I become greatly impatient with any NAEB inclination to avoid doing what others are not doing. I think there is also a need in television for the NAEB to begin to do this same thing.

COMMENT: The only point in bringing up what other people are doing is to examine the question of whether the thing is adequately being done and if someone is doing it, whether we might well concentrate on other areas that are not being served. But, from the standpoint of avoiding anything because of being intimidated or stepping on someone's toes, that's not the concern. BFA has very definitely gone into a number of domestic programs in spite of statements they have made that they are not interested and will not go into domestic programing. They are distributing domestic programs.

(There was considerable discussion on independent production and interchange of programs. At the suggestion that the NAEB might act as distributing agent and engage in special production, the following comment was made.)

COMMENT: There are a great many potential donors of funds willing to put money into television productions. They come to the NAEB with proposals. We've got a big food organization that would like to finance a series and a chemical group that's interested in having us produce a film or a videotape series. This isn't with reference to any guaranteed distribution, but just having the association do the production, which we would, in turn, farm out to member stations. So I think that it's entirely true that there are funds that would be available for carrying on this kind of operation if we chose to go into it.

COMMENT: I have two comments to make in regard to this. One is that my experience and contact with various stations around the country indicates that more and more — and this is particularly true as the station matures in a particular locality — a station finds it difficult to subscribe to a whole program; more and more, they're in need of specialized programs, selective programing rather than to take network block booking. The NAEB should concentrate on supplying the quality kind of thing or the kind of thing that cannot be procured otherwise.

The second comment is that if the NAEB had recording facilities in Washington, we could have provided TV programs that were certainly comparable to the radio programs which were provided, and in many instances because of the visual impact, they would have been far better programs. We have one of the nicest studios I've ever seen, and all the equipment. All we needed was a VTR and we were in business as far as in-studio recording was concerned. But here, in Washington, in the first year of NAEB operation there, we were sitting on a virtual treasure chest of video programing, and for the want of a few simple facilities and someone to do the job, we've denied it. But here's a market that's increasing for selective programing of this kind, and here again we have, along with the radio source in Washington, a source that is not being used by others.

COMMENT: To amplify this, we believe that there is a need for something in television out of Washington that is not now being done. Maybe it is going to be done eight months from now but it is not now being done and if NAEB can serve in this area they should make plans.

However, this is a two-way thing. We don't want to immediately run out and place an individual in charge of television programing and set up a whole procedure as we have with radio until the thing has been studied to see whether it really can be of service.

However, if an individual might be appointed, let's say, to basically work for radio and at the same time to inaugurate a single service as a trial in this area, it should be done. In the meantime we could study the other aspects of the television development to see whether it can be enlarged and continued.

As to raising funds, it might be helpful and fair if funds could be obtained from television stations as well as radio stations to help get this individual working in Washington. In other words, in return for some funds they would get a TV program instead of simply contributing money to support radio.

COMMENT: I don't see that there's any real reason for us to wait or to feel that we are conflicting with anyone. This is a case in which some stations might pay so much a year for the service out of the Washington Center office for things that would otherwise not be available.

COMMENT: I don't see that there's any reason why a member station of the NAEB, if it wanted to couldn't contribute a thousand dollars to the cost of a VTR. It wouldn't take very many stations to buy one, which the NAEB would then have and could exchange for the down payment some programs that would go to the station, the kind of thing that is not now available. The videotapes could be the station's tapes. I think if the NAEB goes into this, it should go into it on the same basis as the radio tapes. It seems to me that this is just a small step which isn't the creation of a network at all, but is just another effort on the part of the NAEB, now that it is in Washington. We can say to our TV members, "If you'll give us enough money to provide us with a tape recorder and tape, we'll begin to do this." I don't see any reason why we can't begin to do it undramatically, gradually, much as we would do anything else. It's a crime that this stuff which is needed — this stuff which we got out by radio but nobody got out by television — is not available on the spectrum.

COMMENT: What I think we should propose is that we start very modestly and without fanfare, with the Washington Report for TV, though as a matter of fact I think the "specials" from Washington are just as important as the Washington Report.

COMMENT: Let's be careful of the radio-television analogy. I think that the television stations are not in the same position as the radio stations in respect to having a particular program need, which at the present time is not being met through varieties of sources. Now, when you look at it from the other side of the coin, there is always a need for additional program resources. When it comes to an exchange of this other nature, then I think we should look at it from one side of the coin as a potential resource that we should not lose sight of, and keep in touch with it and do whatever we can to benefit the exchange, but not assume that a need for this exists at the present time.

COMMENT: I think at this stage we should keep in mind that this is part of educational resources. We're moving more and more broadcasting services into the main stream of our whole educational system, which means that there will be a much greater demand for what we are turning out in the way of educational resources. This demand, I think, will increase. The needs for it will vary, and the uses that are made of it will vary because of the local autonomy, community or state. Somehow, I think this should be related to the in-school, direct-instruction, closed-circuit, general-audience adult education, regardless of what method of distribution may be developing within a given community. If we set up something like this, we're going to have to provide room for variety of uses. This is going to be a pretty big operation and something that goes far beyond what we're talking about now because the closed-circuit uses are going to far outstrip broadcasting stations.

COMMENT: Let me just add to this. I think we should pay heed to a comment made recently by an industry representative. He said, "You know, you people at NAEB may miss the boat if you don't attach more importance to the instructional uses, the nonbroadcast uses, of television. This is where our study and our reports suggest the big development is going to be; and if you people don't do it, if you just adhere to your biases toward broadcasting, you're going to miss the boat and somebody else is going to fill in and take this over." I think there's no question but what there is going to be a tremendous development in filmed videotape resources, particularly as the videotape machines get down to modest cost where they can be distributed widely through the educational system.

Now there's another area which is a fantastic one. This is the foreign market for educational television programs. Their concern is where to get appropriate materials. There are no sources really; and into that vacuum is going to flow all of the junk from commercial television in this country. And one shudders to think of the impression that foreigners will get of America if this is the kind of stuff they're fed. And this is what's developing so far on foreign broadcasting stations; they use whatever they can get. And beautiful things have come from Russia and its satellites, provided free of charge, that they can get a great supply of. This is a tremendously crucial area in which our country is doing nothing so far, to speak of.

COMMENT: If the NAEB thinks, in moving into the exchange and distribution of instruction programs, that it is going to have the same degree of freedom that it has in terms of general programs as far as acceptance and usage are concerned, I think it's mistaken. Because the professional associations represented in the different faculties and the various professional agencies and organizations are involved in this and will play a very strong part in this question of acceptance. The question of the teacher's rights and so on is a very strong concern to the AAUB, the NEA; so these groups now are being brought into the picture. They never have had this problem before, but they are not unaware of it, and I think the relationship in terms of the instructional programs will be quite different from that of the general program.

COMMENT: To get this simple idea of what we're up against in acceptance of instruction material we have to go back to the various states through the years and check on the procedure for textbook acceptance. This has been a major problem in every state, and they've approached it from a hundred different ways. And it's never been above criticism. In most states, there's been a selection at each grade level and each subject area, so that you choose from them; but if the NAEB is going to help guide this (because this is one area where all we can do is to help) and to overcome some of these bad precedents that have been set in the past four or five years, then this goes back to the development of our professional standards, professional standards in all areas. If we can get agreements through some of these meetings that we propose to set up, agreements that such and such is the procedure in providing an instructional program; if we can get some minimum standards that these people will agree to, that this thing will not be accepted or this procedure will not be accepted; if we can draw in some of the people, people who are coming in now to be professionally engaged in the use of television as a kind of exclusive thing — we'll be doing a real service. At the present time, they have absolutely no idea of standards, of usage, except as has been superimposed by foundation efforts. This may be good; it may be bad; you can have your own opinions. But this is all they have, and it's very confusing to most of them. Actually all over the country these people are looking for some kind of leadership and some kind of standards. It's true that Jim Finn and a few other people in DAVI have been giving a lot of thought to these things. But I frankly believe that on the grass roots level — the level that the NAEB has been engaged in, such as our in-school broadcasting, where you get down and know your teachers, where you take years in the system to develop the usage from those teachers — the approach of Finn and DAVI is just as remote from reality as anything in the world.

COMMENT: Maybe I can try and sum up. I think almost everything that's been said here confirms our original statement that, in the field of television, this needs considerable study and that it should be looked into very carefully before certain steps can be taken.

Now it's entirely possible that a study of these needs will disclose that there is no reason why NAEB should even attempt to go into the field of instructional or even cultural programs. However, I still maintain that there is a present need which can be met fairly inexpensively and on an experimental basis. Some progress should be made along those lines. I do not anticipate from all the information I've heard here and outside that any of these other organizations are going to do anything or anticipate doing anything in the particular field we have talked about in relation to Washington.

Now, from the point of view of acceptability in terms of stations, I don't think there is probably any difference between television and radio from this point of view. But when you write to a station and offer them something, nine times out of ten they want to see the kind of thing that you are offering. They are not willing to accept your statement on paper that this is what you intend to do, and I am merely saying something ought to be done. Then on the basis of what has been done we can determine whether this is going to be acceptable and usable by the stations in the same way that we are now feeling our way with certain radio programs.

We're not convinced that 5-minute programs necessarily are going to really be acceptable on a long-term basis by our radio stations or that these stations are going to be satisfied even with these half-hour specials out of Washington permanently. But we went ahead and did them to find out whether they would be acceptable or not, and we are at present gathering information on whether there is a need for them. It's perfectly true that it will cost more money to do something in television than in radio but I think that a start can be made to find out in this very narrow area whether there is a need for it.

Professional Advancement

Discussion

COMMENT: I think this seminar idea is good. Are we going to come up with some kind of measuring stick by which you say that one man is professional and another man isn't? I think we will have to depend upon the more informal but tightly recognized professional standard that exists within the framework of education. Most educators are college graduates who have taken work in certain educational fields that are accepted as professional. And, while they have no exams to pass of a specific nature such as the bar exam, or they may have no period of internship to go through and no Hippocratic oath, nevertheless they are accepted. Within professional education fields you have certain accrediting systems, for teacher training in particular. Maybe something along this line could be done. I think perhaps there would be a sufficient guarantee through methods of this nature that our people, having fulfilled certain of these requirements, would have professional status.

The term "professional" is pretty slippery. Professional in one area means something entirely different than it might mean in another area, and I think we must be very careful when we use this term. As to what we have in mind, personally I would feel that it would be a mistake for the broadcasters or those engaged in educational media fields to be identified in a professional stance. They are mostly purely technical experts. This I think would be in error. I would much rather that the professional term be used in relation to the general educational preparation and background which would not have any direct relationship to the technical or purely mechanical type.

COMMENT: I would like to say that about two years ago, Vernon Bronson drafted a fairly complete proposal of standards, including the "junior fellow," the "senior fellow," and various other levels. We got caught in the dilemma that was just outlined – namely, that if you make tightly worded standards that are specific, they begin to look like technical standards. The alternative to that is to loosen up the language and refer to the general educational qualifications, in which case any well-educated person could be a fellow.

And so it is not that this has not been tried in many drafts. Right now the definition in terms of what we who are inside it understand is very easy. But give it to someone else outside the profession to read, and it means something so wholly different that we need the kind of consultants that were mentioned.

COMMENT: There is another side to this. We can use the language so that any educated person could be considered valid for this type of membership. Over the last five, six, or seven years, we have contacted just about every kind of organization in this country to see what kind of standards they use. But there has to be an experience standard to go along with this kind of thing.

This is true now even in education. It used to be that a teacher graduated from teacher's college or from the university with enough educational methods courses could automatically get a job teaching. This isn't true in most states today. He has to do an internship and there is a minimum. Rating and possibility of promotion in most major school systems today depends upon the length of experience; so in the field of education (and this is becoming true in a lot of areas of college work) it is becoming more and more recognized that the formal instructional area of one's background must be supplemented by experience before it becomes of professional stature. This has been true in medicine and law and these other schools for a long, long time.

So we have felt that this ingredient of experience has to be added. Now as far as the licensing is concerned, being a long-time member of DAVI, I know this has been one of the things that DAVI has had to concern themselves with. In most school systems throughout the country, librarians are certified as librarians by the state certification agency or whatever it might be, usually the state department of education. And they set up a prescribed course in all the schools of education and whatnot for preparation for librarians. And you would be certified as a librarian the same as you would be certified as an English teacher or a math teacher. Up to the present time there has been very little if any certification for audio-visual specialists. This has been the kind of guy that doesn't know very much and doesn't do very much and is sort of in the way most of the time anyway, and who is more concerned with getting his little slips filled out.

However, they are making progress and there is a great deal of effort toward combining these things and actually certifying people in terms of being visual-education specialists and consultants. This same thing may be one of the things that we ought to work for. I don't know.

COMMENT: I was in Indiana when the requirement of certification for audio-visual specialists was gotten through the legislature or the teachers' association, I don't remember where. More recently in some states, there has been an effort made to require that qualification for a person who is engaged in educational television, either in closed circuit or in a station staff position. I point out to you that this is not merely a generally desirable objective for radio-television in the blue-sky area, but there are likely to begin to be more efforts to require this kind of certification, because everybody is beginning to ask if television and radio aren't audio-visual aids, after all, and why don't we require certified audio-visual people in radio and television?

Teacher and Educational Development

Discussion

COMMENT:

I think that we have perceived ourselves as being concerned with the needs of instructional television and what we have discussed has involved instructional television. In this connection I would like to suggest that perhaps the board give some thought to clarifying the respective roles of the utilization committee and the instructional television committee. There seems to be some lack of clarity there. And I would like to underline the point that there is a tremendous amount to be done. When one visits these workshops, one can see that they're terrifically hungry for knowledge and help, and the real problem is that people's time to work with this is extremely limited, done on the basis of odd time and part time and so on, and for that reason very substantial time is greatly needed for accomplishments in an area that is so complicated.

COMMENT:

I've got two notes here that I made yesterday on Harry's talk that I'd like to take up again. As you know I attended a meeting of the school planners in Washington not long ago. A lot of architects were there. There are literally hundreds of millions of dollars for school buildings, college buildings, and junior college buildings all over the country. And every one of these places is at a loss about how a building should be planned from the standpoint of reception, sound and light, and seating arrangements for both small and large classes with soundproof separations, and this sort of thing.

The report that was put out by the Ford Foundation (Chapman Associates Report) went to some length in some of this planning. But the kind of things that they talk about — actual day-to-day usage in the classroom and by the teacher, reception, and distribution within the school, and this sort of thing from a technical standpoint — is something that all of these fellows are still at a loss about.

The tragedy of it is, and it was expressed there, that whatever they put in today is going to have to stand for a long time, and there is going to be a much bigger job getting revisions than if some kind of information could be gotten out to these people before they build as to how rooms should be arranged, divided, or soundproofed; how to cut out light from windows; and the simple idea of adequate conduiting and wiring.

The other note was on in-service teacher education. I've had any number of people say to me on both the college level and the school level in the past year that they'd like to set up some in-service teacher education programs on utilization or on television teaching, but they don't know how to go about it. The techniques of in-service teacher education for utilization and for actual television teaching are an area that this committee might well work on and put out something that could be made available generally.

ANSWER: I believe the NAEB should look at this within the framework of a number of agencies and organizations that are just as concerned with this as we are. They are active in it, and this includes everything from the Ford Foundation to the U.S. Office of Education.

Now. What is our place in this? Do we want to get into this and in what way? We do have some stake in it because in many instances it is our membership that will be actively involved in problems of this kind, and for that reason we would hope that they would turn to NAEB for some assistance and advice, guidelines, resources, and materials in this connection. But if we are going to get into this, how do we get into it? how far do we get into it? in what way? and in what relationship to other agencies and organizations that are actively concerned and involved in it too? And this is something in which I think the role of the NAEB should be worked out. I think a committee can do this. I think this is something we have to do.

COMMENT: These are broad questions. But I think that this calls for a general statement. This kind of thing is the kind of thing that NAEB is faced with on every problem. We're in the largest, broadest area of human endeavor that I know of. That's education. So there is absolutely no area that we can suggest that we have some sort of vested interest in that somebody else isn't also interested in. As a professional organization it seems to me that we have no obligation as long as we see a need as far as our membership is concerned. Very frankly, in these two areas right here, I feel that the NAEB membership is probably more qualified on what to do than practically any other organization. What I'm saying is that we simply can't use as a guideline what the other fellow is doing. We're going to have to do it. If the other fellow is doing something similar, we'll offer to coordinate, cooperate, and work with him.

COMMENT: As a result of the recommendations to come out of the McBride-Meierhenry study, I think it's safe to say that within the near future there will be activation of both a national and several regional centers for distributing instructional materials. If this was one of the needs the NAEB had in mind to service that is not now serviced, I think this might be taken care of.

Member Services

Discussion

COMMENT: As I see the growth and development of the NAEB from a relatively small group consisting primarily of station managers and program and production personnel; and then it opened up with the expansion of the stations and the inclusion of television; and then individual membership, the taking in of classroom teachers — I think we are beginning to move into the position where we have to constantly look to the rapidly expanding membership. In relation to all the new teachers that we are concerned with regarding active membership we are going to be in the relatively new situation of the DAVI, and we will have the same problem they have. One of the answers for them is that they have two publications. One of them is their homey-type magazine — in other words, information to the members, what the committees are doing, who is doing what to whom, and so on and so forth. And then they have the *Audio-Visual Communication Review* which is their professional magazine for research and technical publications. I think we are trying to do the latter (in the *Journal*) more than we are the former. The *Newsletter* has its other points. Perhaps these channels of communication will have to be carefully designed so that we can keep this kind of communication flowing so the members will feel that they are actively informed and know what is going on; so that they will be aware of the problems of development and at the same time have the benefit of this other kind of news service of technical developments, new kinds of articles and information. Again this ties back in with the whole communications problem.

As to the matter of involvement of members in Association activities, I believe in it firmly. I offer for purposes of at least consideration, not argument, the thought that when NAEB looks at its future, and in terms of developing a real position of leadership, we cannot follow such a system of involvement through a broad committee structure. We are going to have to look for other methods and other means.

I know this isn't a popular idea, but this is something that I think that we ought to look at with a fresh viewpoint in terms of the immense expansion in our membership, and the tremendous potential expansion that exists. And we should examine also this important problem of establishing a real identity with the Association, a clear flow of communication, and some kind of procedure for handling the problems that we face in this expanding period.

ANSWER: My own thought is that the best way of doing it is through the regional directors; we all have printing presses and we can use them for the benefit of everyone in the region. If this is to be effective, someone is going to have to tell us when radical departure from policy is contemplated.

COMMENT: We are often guilty of waiting to report things until they are accomplished facts. If we have a good many things going, rather than reporting on things that are under way or things that we are working toward, we tend to report something that succeeded or has been achieved. If it doesn't succeed we don't mention it. We report on the things that we achieve, and I think that this is unfortunate. The officers ought to keep the membership au courant with all kinds of developments. Certainly the Newsletter could carry a good deal more of such information. In fact the president might do a column that would provide chatty, informal reporting of current activities.

COMMENT: The important thing is that the publications need direction. Here is Rosenheim [see his letter in Appendix] to say that some of our publications should follow the pattern of The Listener. If we are going to have a broad representation of NAEB membership, then the professor of zoology who appears once in a while on TV has no need to know what goes on at a 10-watt station in Southern Rhodesia. Either we have to have a number of publications or we have to decide that they are going to have interest for a particular group. Some of the comments against the original Newsletter were that it was too chatty, too homey. But this is the warp and woof of the organization. If we don't put this in, then people don't know what is going on. There should be some basic study of who we want to reach with the publications we have and then we should go about doing it and continually say that this is the group that we want to reach.

COMMENT: Back to this involvement, and in support of it. The organization nearest to ours in potential size, at least, is the DAVI. The DAVI has about 5,000 members. We potentially have about that number of members at the present time. If we claim all the station people, our membership is up to about 4,500. There's no good reason why we shouldn't have 5,000 people at the present time. DAVI has several really fine techniques of involvement which we might profitably follow.

Number 1 is the publication which tells about everything and everybody; it has articles in it, but it also has personal news and news of headquarters, and they mention everything. The more technical and academic stuff you get in the Review. Number 2, they have a convention, and they involve directly, and usually by photograph, one out of every five of their total membership in actual convention assignments. Now they know that they are going to have at least a thousand people at that convention who are going to definitely do something. Their names are mentioned at least three times in the program. This thing is worth more today than any technical service they can find.

COMMENT:

I would like to strongly second the suggestion that more awards, particularly at conventions, be made by NAEB. I talked with a good many people down in Columbus this year, and more than ever before there is a consensus that educational broadcasters are not being given the recognition that they should.

I think that we are not stepping on anybody's toes, but this is all business of our organization. Here is something that I feel very strongly we ought to do, whether we continue to cooperate with the IERT and its award system or not. We should do our own and make them just as significant.

Research Activities

Discussion

COMMENT: The one essential ingredient of professionalism, it seems to me, is that this is a body of skills and specializations that are built on systematic research and knowledge. That may make it kind of a slow process to obtain the deference we would like to get, both in the community and in the university in which some of us are based. Nevertheless, I don't see any other way. This is a compelling reason for the world of educational broadcasting to examine its role in research carefully at this stage.

There are two words right in the title of the organization that give us answers as to why we need to be involved continuously in research. One is that we are broadcasters and that necessarily involves being concerned with the consequences of what we do, regardless of what kind of broadcasting we are doing. This is essential, but by and large we have not done much of a job there.

The other word is, of course, education — and we are part of the process of learning how we can be more effective as educators. Now in a way this leads us in a couple of unfortunate directions because much of the commercial broadcasting research that we might model after is obviously superficial and of very little interest to us — the kind of things that goes into rating services and so forth. This misleads us and, for that matter, a lot of the school-of-education type of research is not representative necessarily of the best. But these are two powerful reasons why we need to be involved in a very large way with research continuously, and to make it an integrated part of the total operation. Our misconceptions about what research is, often lead us into thinking that this is something that we can shunt off to one side and not make it an integrated part of the total operation; that it's head counting and so forth. Research should be defined broadly and it involves a whole spectrum — from the humanistic, historical, legal, and such, to the most systematic quantitative and behavioral areas.

An aspect of research on which we sometimes founder is the business of pure vs. applied. Here again, as we are both broadcasters and educators, we are concerned with what we can know about the immediate impact of a program or series, and, in this respect, applied research is indicated — a kind of continuing self-appraisal.

But this is not the thing that gives us the long-range gains. We need also to be concerned with the ways in which we can foster basic research in the whole communications process. There is a very active business going on in and out of the universities, a rapid growth of research centers and graduate programs, in communications and in mass communications, and educational broadcasting has been, at best, on the fringe of this. This is a significant and rapid development and we ought to be a part of it. There are ways in which we can be a part of it. The university-based station can become a research facility in addition to a broadcasting facility; that is to say, a research facility available for the social psychologist or the sociologist who is interested in this process in some special way, the applications of which are not immediately apparent at all. The community-based stations are an important facility of this kind too, because in some respects the community is the obvious unit for carrying on this kind of thing.

At the same time the involvement of educational broadcasters directly, as much as they can contribute to the development of basic communication research, whether it originates in speech or journalism or sociology or psychology or wherever, is something that is going to reap the benefits that are not immediately apparent but is a long-range sort of thing. There will be status benefits among others, but this is not the central issue by any means. It means that in a long-range test we'll understand this process in which we are involved.

Technical Services

Discussion

COMMENT: There's a necessity for upgrading and standardizing technical quality of our stations (and I don't mean taking a poor station and making it better; I'm saying we need to take what would be considered a good station and improve its technical standards too). So often a station cannot do this itself; it must have help.

QUESTION: It seems to me that it's terrifically important for our organization to have this technical ability somewhere, this technical talent. I remember back in 1945 I was assigned to the job by the FCC. I was in charge of noncommercial educational FM, and we had an engineer in the FCC assigned specifically at that time to work with the educators. His main job was to consult with them and to give them technical advice. There was an attitude in the Commission at that time that the FCC had an obligation to do what the statute said to promote the more effective use of radio in the public interest and that this involved the use of some of the FCC engineering staff, who worked with the educators. We had a number of conferences with representatives of NAEB and with the Office of Education and other organizations. What is the attitude of the FCC at present on this?

ANSWER: It is reported that there is active consideration about the establishment of an educational section within the FCC, to deal especially with problems concerning educational broadcasting. I think this may very well come into being.

Publicity and Public Relations

Discussion

COMMENT: Might it not be possible, through the cooperation of NAEB stations to produce promotional material on a regional level? In other words, each of the existing NAEB regions, on a rotating basis, say, could produce a radio tape (and actually I don't see why not a videotape from time to time) on the developments on the regional level of noncommercial broadcasting. These would be aimed at the general public to bring them up to date on what is being done. With all the interest in TV programing and education, in general, at the moment, not one of the national networks has produced a program on this, although they have produced them on developments in medicine, general education, and so forth. Might it not be possible to make program proposals of this nature? One or two programs dealing with any aspect of our work could be of tremendous public relations benefit.

COMMENT: Might it be appropriate from a public relations point of view to have PR broadcasting seminars at the regional or national meetings of such organizations as the PTA and the Junior League?

COMMENT: Again in terms of cooperating with commercial interests, we might work with TIO in terms of publicizing good commercial programs as well as educational programs. This has been done on the local level sometimes where noncommercial stations have helped to promote the sustaining programs of the local network affiliates and the commercial station has promoted the local educational station. On the national level, perhaps the TIO would be cooperative.

COMMENT: Would it be possible for the NAEB to suggest in one way or another to all member station managers that they hold briefing sessions in their own shops to explain the function and purposes of NAEB and actively encourage individual membership?

COMMENT: Has the organization ever considered developing a body of public information and program promotional aids? The amount of promotion for particular programs that has been engaged in by the educational stations is spotty. Some of it is spectacularly good, but inadequate even to inform our potential audience of what is coming off. Even if *The Listener* magazine should not turn out to be possible we can have the day-to-day promotion of the good things that are coming up.

COMMENT: In relation to what has just been said about PR and programs, I would hope that the Association in the very near future would be in a position to send with programs actual promotion pieces, either on tape or, preferably, to be read by a local announcer. I would hope also that the Association would have some type of recognition other than a wallet card for its membership -- a lapel pin, or a tie clasp, or I don't know what it might be, but some visual sign that he could carry with him to places where the NAEB might become better known. And also I think that the Association should make more available to all members, supplies of the brochure material that we *do* have of a PR nature. I know that in my contacts with students and other people I systematically pass out this information but I wonder if others do that, so that what NAEB is doing and what it stands for in actual membership information is disseminated to a wider group of people.

Promotional Development and Activation

Discussion

COMMENT: I'm not sure what "promotional development" means. On the activation end of things, I think there is no dispute, no argument here, on the proposal that we need to activate many, many more stations. Moreover we ought to activate the station first; construct the facilities, and then it will be used. I will also go further and say that it's not just the transmitter facility in terms of a given television or radio station; now we are very much concerned with interconnection as part of the facility. And therefore the problem is not whether or not this is our objective, but how do we accomplish this objective? What can NAEB do specifically to insure that more stations are activated, that more stations are interconnected? There are two major prerequisites for the activation of any station. First, educational support, and secondly, financial support. Ordinarily there has to be great educational interest in the state and then the financial support comes in from governmental or from private sources as a result of educators generally seeing the tremendous need for this and going out and asking for financial support from various sources.

The educational need comes first. How do we convince legislatures in benighted regions that educational television is something they should do, and educational television is something that is needed? Once educators are convinced then of course we have the beginnings of a financial plan, whether it be addressed to the legislature, to business, to foundations, or where. But perhaps the first thing we ought to do is try to find out what is to be done to convince educators that this is needed and necessary. We should make no small plans. First of all, we fire not only educators' imaginations, but we also fire the imagination of the public when we propose rather large schemes. Now, the next question is what can NAEB do beyond this imaginative thing? This is what we want to be good at; this is one of the things we love to do best. We ought to be able, from our expertise, to devise things like an open-circuit Hagerstown...like a regional interconnection...or double or triple regional interconnection. We ought to be able to do things that will seize upon the imaginations of educators and potential supporters alike.

The second thing then comes down to the matter of techniques. How do we win friends and influence legislators? On this there is much less expertise available than there is on some of these other things. One of the things that we ought to do is to aid each other in a sort of pooling of experience. Those who have dealt with legislatures successfully ought to make their experience available to others. Those who deal successfully with business firms and with foundations again ought to make their experience available.

COMMENT: The pattern of the future that seems evident throughout the country is that the major support and the future development of educational television or station acquisitions is going to come from tax funds. Even today in our community stations the predominance of support is directly or indirectly from tax funds.

Certainly the projections that we have on the board at the present time are all on the basis of tax funds. Therefore this reinforces the idea that a technique would be helpful in approaching legislatures and committees, and people who have charge of educational policies and administration. When we're talking to people who have to do with education, the people who are concerned with the idealism of the public school system on whatever level, or the projection of general education to the public, we have to talk about betterness. These people want to know about better instruction. How are you going to improve it? How are you going to make it easier for people to get?

But when you talk to these hard-nosed guys on the appropriations committee, whether they are local people who control budgets on school boards or whether they are state legislators, or whatever, you'll find they are not a bit concerned about the improvement of instruction, at least not in their official capacities. They want to know about the dollars and cents. A lot of proposals and projects have bogged down because the people locally do not try to promote these things. When they got past this better instruction idea, when they got past the educators and idealists and the people interested in the government of the community, and got up to the hard-nosed money men, they didn't have the answers. So one of the responsibilities that NAEB has in this area is to try to ferret out all the possible questions and supply the answers that will be acceptable to the money men. Now we've done our research on education. We know how we can teach and how effectively. We have all this to back it up, but unfortunately at the hearings in Washington and all of these other places, the only time we had any kind of information that would appeal to the money men was the testimony from Joe Hall. This is unfortunate because there are some good arguments that can be presented.

COMMENT: We are educators. We believe in improving our quality of instruction, and we are sensitive to the teacher. We know if the teacher and educator isn't with us, we're in trouble. When we get into the state legislature's appropriations committee, these people couldn't care less about the matter; they want to know if it would save money in absolutely blunt terms. There is great danger, of course, in selling educational television on a money-saving basis unless we can really back it up with facts.

There's a certain amount of evidence. Joe Hall's testimony is the best piece of evidence. Then there's the statement of Dr. Williams, president of the University of Houston, that if they didn't have the TV courses they would spend 2 million dollars for a building, and $80,000 in one department alone. All of these things ought to be put together, because this is the truth. TV can, properly used, save money by improving the quality of instruction. We've been a little bit more afraid, I think, of the AAUP than we have of the appropriations committee of the legislature. Now I'm not advocating defiance of the AAUP or the NEA, but I am saying we aren't going to go where we want to go until that appropriations committee is convinced, and there is actual material available, and to that extent I think the idea of a manual explaining all this is a good idea.

COMMENT: I think there are several things that we need to do. One is to review the efforts to date in promotional development and activation — the NAEB and the efforts of other organizations as well. More importantly, it is what has not been done in the whole area of acquisitions. I don't think that there is one of us who is not all for activation of any sort. But I think that herein lies one of our problems. What does activation and promotional development include? Activation means more than simply activating stations; it means closed-circuit development; it means the increased use of all educational media. Where should we cut this off? What does this activation problem mean for us? At one end is national support, development of the educational program at the national level, and the relationships with national and official organizations. Federal aid is part of it, all the way down to promoting state-wide development, promoting regional exchange in every connection, and promoting the use of educational broadcasting on our own campuses and in our own school systems. Promotional development means a number of things: Promote to the legislature, the parent, the teacher, the administrator, the student, the viewer, the faculty, the neighbors, the taxpayers, and you can keep adding to this list of people whom we need to inform. We need a pool of specialists on call — people with physical experience, technical and administrative experience, people with promotional, educational experience in utilizing television and radio at the elementary and secondary levels and the collegiate level.

Policy Guidance and Direction

Discussion

COMMENT: Policy is generally formulated in terms of purpose, goal, objective, and posture and stance or philosophical attitude maintained while proceeding toward that goal. In our effort to share our enthusiasm, to win acceptance for our conviction that we have the means to reach educational goals speedily and effectively, I think we often come to regard ourselves as custodians of a kind of education or an area of education or a type of education rather than as custodians of the instruments (the camera) whereby we proceed toward the general goal. I recall our effort at our first seminar in 1949 to spell out our goals. We were tempted in the beginning to state what the goals were of educational radio only. Very quickly we concluded that in order to determine the goals of educational broadcasting we had to determine the goals of education in general. We have to remind ourselves of that, and frequently. In determining what our policy should be, we ought to identify with the general policy of the educational philosophers of the country and keep pace with this as it changes and is adapted to new conditions and new situations.

COMMENT: We begin to get into trouble with the policy of the NAEB when we think of it as a national movement. It is essentially local, regardless of whether it is closed-circuit, FM, or whatever it is. As an institutional service it is on the air. We tend to forget on occasion the tremendous diversity of educational broadcasting. We wonder what the policy should be when there is so much variety in objective. Essentially what we consider Educational Broadcasting is local. It seems to me that the reason and the need for a national organization is to help each member station do a better job, each in its own way. Educational objectives do change from time to time. Certainly the local operators of these individual stations will sense and realize what these changes are and change their own objectives. These changes will be reflected in what the individuals seek as an organization; the NAEB policy will change as various local objectives change in various areas.

COMMENT: There is confusion in education today as to these purposes and objectives, and we are caught up in this. This condition stems from the fact that formerly decisions were locally determined and somewhat within the capacity of the local community to carry out. Education and local conditions today cannot be thought of as strictly in the framework of the community — not even necessarily within the state. Apparently, the conditions of life today and the problems that we face call for something other than this. A school child in a small rural community will probably not continue to live in that community, because he will go somewhere else to work, somewhere else to live.

The problem of education is what to do for the student within the framework of his local community that will fit him to take his place in a larger community than that in which he grew up. Under these conditions, the goals and purposes of a local educational system are complicated by the necessity to consider the larger problem. This is reflected in all of the differences we get as to whether progressive education has any value today, or whether it has ever had any value, or whether we should return to the strictly academic curriculum. So we have the conflicts in education philosophy. There is no agreement really coming about in education as to what its purposes are; they are struggling to reach some kind of understanding that is necessary. As broadcasters we are going to be caught in this same situation. That's why the local broadcaster is not in any better position than the local school superintendent when it comes to thinking in terms of what he needs to do in that community.

COMMENT: One of the significant things that has come out in this business about local control of education—and this has been mentioned in terms of television installations, and I remember when it was mentioned in radio installations—is that today we have 5 million American families that are mobile every year. They are constantly on the move, 5 million. Some communities have much larger mobility than others, but they all have a certain amount of it, because this is the decentralizing of industry and the moving of plants from large centers into a number of small centers and people moving. So not only is a small-town boy preparing to be a citizen in a large city, but many millions of our children have to get their education as they touch base here and there over the country.

Now as to policy regarding this. This really points up the fact that it is a matter of national policy and not just an aid to individuals running their own little individual community. There has been a great play in the last eighteen months on teaching machines. Some people, in the field of education, have used teaching machines as a kind of antidote to the development of television in school. These are the same people who have said that television, instructional television or television instruction, is just another audio-visual aid. Well, two things have come out of this within the last year in spite of all these pressures.

One is that all teaching machines are today obsolete, even before they're put on the market and bought, because the basis of the teaching machine is program instruction, and program instruction in its end result can probably be done better by television than it can be done by a lot of bulky machines piled into a classroom.

2

The other thing is that if we're going to assume a national policy regarding all of these manifestations of teaching media that we see in the future, we have to recognize, and be willing to stand up and fight for, the idea that this is not another audio-visual tool — that this is a new method of teaching, a new method of instruction, a synthetic method, if you will, which comprises a whole lot of things, and which takes a lot of the old and adds a good deal of the new, but puts it together. It's not just another audio-visual tool. It is a new method of teaching. Many people have not realized the values inherent in this instrument with which we're involved. So NAEB has a responsibility to evolve a policy which will promote an understanding in the field of education generally, of the instructional values involved here. That is, it is more than just putting a teacher in front of a camera; it's more than supplementary or enrichment. And unless we as a group are willing to recognize this as a policy and promote it as a policy, we're going to suffer in the field of education accordingly.

QUESTION: I think our committee would like to have the judgment of the group on this question: Should a statement of policy emerging from the committee deliberations and the seminar be a statement of policy on educational broadcasting or a statement of policy that would embrace the various objectives of the number of educational institutions that are using broadcasting? Let's be specific — Benson Polytechnic Institute in Portland, Oregon, or a school for KTOY, Tacoma, or let us say, Indiana University. Public relations, promotion, student training are not examples of educational broadcasting. And so do we try to define a statement of policy for our organization which includes all of these off-shoots — student training, public relations, promotion, etc.?

COMMENT: On this policy matter, let's not tie ourselves to any one group. There are numerous major philosophies of education; which one of these differing philosophies do we espouse? I'd hate to see us commit ourselves to what is essentially an American Council of Education philosophy of education or a Land-Grant College philosophy of education, let alone a parochial, religious philosophy of education. I don't have a positive suggestion, but I say we have to avoid taking any one group on this as our mentor, as our single guide. We represent all sorts of different institutions and educational philosophies. By our very nature, then, something of a consensus rather than of any one educational point of view is what we must be concerned with.

The second thing comes down to a more practical aspect. I am desperately concerned with how we give guidance to our officers and our spokesmen on matters that may very well be life and death for the individual station. How do we determine whether or not our spokesmen are representing a point of view with which we are in agreement? Or that they're representing a point of view with which 90 per cent of those they represent are in agreement, or two-thirds? This is a practical matter. I'm concerned with what kind of policy can be put in so that our spokesmen do represent what we, at least, conceive to be our interest.

COMMENT: I would suppose that one policy of NAEB is to continue to serve all of the legitimate interests of its various members or various categories of its members. I suppose that this is one objective, and it's probably the objective that initially brings members into NAEB. And it's one that we can't overlook in the future. Then when we get a national organization, the organization itself, it seems to me, generates certain national goals that very often go beyond the specific local objectives of the various components. And we certainly have come to the point of having these national goals. Now, what do we do with these national goals; how do we achieve them? This is a matter I think we need to explore. Do we go into the various local communities where different kinds of operations are in effect now and try to persuade them to perhaps change their ways and to raise their sights or standards? And then move into the international area, which is one of our areas of greatest opportunity at the moment to be of great service.

This has nothing at all to do really or directly with the initial reason we became members of NAEB. This is beyond the original purposes of organizing a group of scattered individuals. We need policy in this area so that the individual member stations know that a national organization exists not only to serve them and their particular local need, but with other specific purposes. And when they get information from headquarters that we have four new contacts with foreign governments, that the organization is not forgetting Pocatello, Idaho, or Phoenix, Arizona, but that the organization is simply doing part of its established mission and following its general policies. I think these things need to be enunciated, set down so that as people come into NAEB they know what it stands for, and when it is operating within its objectives. I think this is urgent, probably more so than ever before because things are changing so fast.

COMMENT: It seems to me that any organization ought to have some general ideals for which it stands, and these may change from time to time. And this doesn't mean that we can live up to them. But nevertheless, I think there's desirability even though we may have to fight it out to some extent to attempt to arrive at some general principles. For example, I'm very much impressed with the direction this organization is taking in the consideration of international problems. It seems to me that here's an area in which we ought to be exercising leadership. I simply would like to support the idea that it's desirable for an organization to have some general ideals toward which to strive.

International Relations

Discussion

CHAIRMAN: With the permission of the chairmen of the financial support and international relations groups, I am going to speak about this whole general area, because the two are tied together. And this will be by way of providing some general background information for their use in preparing final reports.

I'm tempted to begin in a rather emotional fashion because I have strong feelings about the international area. It is certainly important that we do everything that we can to service the educational community of this country, but I have a strong feeling that unless we are also concerned with the spreading of enlightenment in the uncommitted countries of the world, we're not going to have time to improve our own system, to make decisions about the future of our own system, or, in fact, have any future at all.

I'm not the only person that has been abroad and come back with strong reactions of this kind. The State Department people always warn you before you go abroad that you should be prepared for a cultural shock. But the cultural shock is the one that you get when you come back to this country — that is, in terms of the general lack of sensitivity, concern, and interest about what's going on in the rest of the world. And so when I say I speak with some emotion about these matters, this reflects my recent exposure to being on what you might call the "cutting edge" of the cold war.

Up until the last year and a half, NAEB's concern with international relations was largely one of program exchange. Then about eighteen months ago, largely through Harry Skornia's stimulus, a statement was prepared, called "A Proposed Approach to the Communications Problem in Newly Developing Areas." I want to read just a few phrases from it to give you a notion of its content. It's actually about a twelve-page paper which Harry largely wrote.

"Many countries just emerging from a colonial status are on the threshold of activating television and radio systems. The systems they select, the philosophies they adopt, and the standards, equipment, and training with which they start, are likely to determine their direction for all time. Most of these countries need help in determining the size and the nature of the systems best suited to their needs, and in effectively utilizing such systems for the benefit of their citizens. If we, as a nation, do not help meet this need, one of the most crucial phases of American foreign operations abroad will have been overlooked. Nowhere as much as in the minds of men can the safeguards of democracy and peace be erected.

"There are two major dangers in political misuse of such powerful communication instruments. We believe that the greatest insurance against this danger is by developing at the outset an association between such systems and the traditions and concepts of broadcasting in a free society. Second is the danger of failure to use such instruments effectively for education."

The paper then goes on to describe the help to our government which the NAEB, as an organization of communication specialists without any particular axe to grind or any hardware to sell, might play in assistance to developing countries, in the development of electronic systems for enlightenment and education.

This document was circulated among a number of federal agencies and met with considerable sympathetic response. One of the first results was the Sudan contract which represented some shift in ICA procedure. This was the first contract ever granted to an association. Heretofore ICA had usually contracted with individuals, industrial concerns, or colleges or universities. The Sudan contract, as you know, provides for sending a team of three specialists to Khartoum for a two-year period to assist the Sudanese government in the improvement and development of their radio system and the training of local personnel. It's entirely possible that the Sudanese contract may be extended from two to four years.

I feel that we have an obligation, both as experts in the field of communications and as patriotic citizens, to do what we can to serve our country in what really is a fight for its survival. I think also that it is perfectly appropriate for the Association to be concerned with this area, since, certainly, part of our tradition and policy and purpose has always been to see to it that these instruments are responsibly used for the benefit of mankind. If at the same time, we can also derive from these activities supporting funds for improving and expanding both our international service and our domestic service, this is all to the good.

Growing out of our interest in helping underdeveloped countries, a more specific paper on educational TV in foreign assistance was developed which we succeeded in taking to the White House and bringing to the attention of some special advisers to the President. They were interested in it, asked us to go back and write a more lengthy document containing a great deal more specific information. This, in effect, was a plan to use television as an instrument of American foreign policy. It was predicated on these simple premises:

Our national survival depends on the enlightened choice that uncommitted countries are going to make between our system and another system. Enlightened choices cannot be made by unenlightened people. Over half of the world's people cannot read or write; and therefore, a massive attack on illiteracy on a world-wide scale would seem to be in our national interest. In fact it is a crime, if this country does not utilize one of it's major resources, one which it has in greater quantity than any country in the world – that is, know-how in the educational uses of television. This can be utilized as a means of helping these countries telescope into a short time the development that has taken the more advanced countries some centuries to achieve. Our thesis was simply that television is an instrument that is capable of teaching more things to more people in less time than anything yet devised. Therefore, we saw ETV, together with American manufacturing know-how on a mass production basis, as a major means to assist our government in helping these countries overcome illiteracy and develop social and economic well-being in the less advanced areas, while at the same time building a continuing and favorable image of the United States around the world. This we felt could be done by activating in these underdeveloped countries educational television broadcasting systems designed to meet the needs of each individual country.

Again, our memo met with response. They called from the White House one day and asked if we could send another fifteen copies for distribution. A copy of this memorandum was also given to Phil Coombs, the Assistant Secretary for Cultural Affairs; his office asked permission to duplicate copies for distribution to the people concerned. That's where the proposal is at the moment. It's hung up, I think, on the question of what's going to happen in the organization of the new aid program and what the congressional reaction is to the President's request for aid funds.

One immediate reaction, however, has been the positive interest of the Vice President, who, on the basis of his visit to Pakistan, became extremely interested in TV as an aspect of foreign aid. In a session with Leonard Marks and George Reedy, of the Vice President's staff, Mr. Johnson expressed great interest in TV's development in that country. Consequently, Pakistan may be one of the areas in which there will be a tremendous development of educational television – and one in which the NAEB will have a part in the counseling and training program.

One of our other recognitions in the international field was the choice of the NAEB by the State Department to represent American educational television at the first International Conference on Television Arts which was held in Montreux, Switzerland, in May. It seemed that we ought to accept this invitation if we could possibly finance it. Through the assistance of Mr. Marks, the NAEB, and my own personal contribution, arrangements were made for me to attend the conference and present a paper on ETV in the U.S. Since I was there, and since there was an EBU conference to be held in a week in Copenhagen, it appeared that these two could be combined with some side trips from which the organization might profit. Accordingly, I visited Rome and met with Professor Neri, who is in charge of an EBU conference that is to be held early in December in Rome, on the educational aspects of television. This is the conference which Leonard Marks suggested at the Madrid meeting of the EBU and which the Italians offered to host.

I spent two hours with Professor Neri, who was grateful for some ideas I was able to offer on how to organize a conference of this kind. We have obtained initial financing for sending an NAEB team to this conference through one of the electronic firms, and we're going to seek more funds. My hope is that we can send a team of NAEB people who are experts in various special areas of educational television to make a first-rate presentation on educational television in this country. I want to do it as a team proposition with a complete script and rehearsed presentation, to do a really polished production to show those from other countries. A special effort will be made to get delegates from all of the newly developing countries to attend this particular conference. Participation in this meeting in Rome will provide another opportunity for the NAEB to gain international recognition.

From Rome I went to Ankara, where I met with Mr. Sonmez, deputy director of information and broadcasting, to talk about developing educational uses for the existing Turkish radio system and possibilities of subsequently developing a television system. I also met with all of the English-speaking members of Radio Ankara, discussing the possibilities for a more formalized, organized approach to instructional use of their radio system. The result of these conversations has been that a proposal has been prepared for sending an NAEB team to Turkey. The team would consist of a curriculum specialist, an engineer, and a production specialist. Initially they would be concerned with expanding the educational uses of the existing radio facilities. Almost simultaneously, they would begin a study of what educational television might do to augment the radio system and strengthen the educational program of the country. Turkey is a land in which there are about 65 per cent of the 28 million people who cannot read or write, and that rate is even higher in the little villages, of which there are about 45,000, many of which have no teachers at all. They need about 70,000 trained teachers, and they need them yesterday. It will take them ten years under normal circumstances to train that many teachers. They were very much interested in the possibilities of both teacher training via radio and attacks on illiteracy via television. One of the interesting things I found with all of the people to whom I talked was that, though they were much concerned with training the young people, they feel they can't wait for them to grow up. They need ways of teaching the older people right now, because they need an enlightened population as fast as they can get it.

Next, I went to Tehran and saw Jim Slack, who is a USOM officer there in radio and television. He made arrangements for me to see the assistant minister of education about the possibilities of using radio and television for education. That country, like all of these countries, is very much interested in television. The story is that in all of these new countries, their status symbol sequence is a Hilton hotel first and then a television station. But I don't want to be facetious about it because these people are terribly serious and concerned. And they see modern technology as a means of maximizing their existing educational resources and of leap-frogging the tremendous distance that they have to go to catch up.

Then I went to Khartoum, where Syd Head was already on the premises. I met with all of the top people in radio there and they are very grateful for the assistance we're providing. I also met the people in the ICA mission. I think Syd is off to a good start and will do an excellent job. Bud Phillips has joined him, and the transmitter man will be chosen shortly to go over and complete the team.

The Sudanese, too, are very much interested in television. They're not making immediate plans, but are looking hopefully toward this development.

In Paris, I stopped by briefly to meet with all our old friends, like Madame Paz and Monsieur Robida. An interesting thing — I hadn't realized this — is that as you go down the corridor, there's a great big NAEB sign on the door in the French Broadcasting System. This is where our former Fulbright Fellows had their office, and the sign is still on the door, big as life. They say, "Well, we keep it there because we're still providing programs for the NAEB, and Madame Paz is our NAEB liaison officer. So we leave this on the door."

Then I went to Copenhagen for the general assembly meeting of EBU. This is the first time, I think, that the president of our Association has attended an EBU meeting, although we have belonged to EBU for seven years. I had the opportunity to give a speech, and thus was able to make NAEB better known and understood by our colleagues abroad. It also provided a number of leads for further discussion. Both at the Montreux conference and at this one, people came up to talk to me about our organization and to learn more about its activities. I was asked to write two articles, one for an electronics magazine in London, and one for the TV International magazine, about NAEB. As a result of these two appearances, I think we have a little more visibility internationally now than perhaps we've had here before.

As to other areas in which we now have active negotiation, specific proposals, at governmental request, are being prepared for a South American country and for an African country. These are phased programs to provide technicians for complete TV packages including personnel training plans for three to five years, similar to the Turkish plan already discussed.

On the basis of a recommendation in an economic survey done by Checchi and Company for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, we have just set up a proposal for utilizing an NAEB technical team to train local personnel in television operation in another African country.

In still another African country, they have TV going in one section of the country on a commercial basis. The other section very much wants to start a television station but only on an educational basis. And they are interested in assistance along those lines.

We have met with the ambassador from a Central American country a couple of times. He wants to put in a television system for teaching reading and writing in his country. And it is now proposed that this be introduced in the Montevideo conference of South American states, which is to meet in October, 1961. A proposal for American assistance might be put into the Alliance for Progress program for South America. And if he succeeds in getting this in the agenda, he will ask that the NAEB come down and make the proposal at the conference.

There are a number of other areas in the international scene in which negotiations and various contacts are in progress; I won't go into these. I think you have to understand that some of these will take one to two years for fruition; but there is a likelihood that these projects will be in the magnitude of 1 to 1-1/2 million dollars within the next two or three years.

There is interest in having the NAEB take over a broad training program whereby it would undertake the coordinating role for broadcast personnel that visit the United States to get training in educational uses of radio and television. Currently, the ICA, the USIA, the Small Business Administration, the State Department, etc., are all handling this kind of activity, and sometimes the programs are not coordinated. The notion is that an organization of a national character such as ours, that has this kind of know-how in broadcasting, is well suited to provide a coordinating and programing function here, in seeing to it that these people are sent to the most appropriate places to get the kind of training best suited to their needs. Under this arrangement, the NAEB would organize on a cooperative basis a kind of loose federation of colleges and universities that would participate in the program designed to utilize their facilities and staffs to provide the best possible training for foreign broadcast personnel.

We've also had some discussions with representatives of international labor unions about setting up a training program or even a training center in this country for international telecommunication people to be trained here. They have the funds available and are very much interested.

Up until now the NAEB has cooperated with a great many agencies in giving them advice about possible personnel for assignments of various kinds, and this activity is being set up on a more formalized basis.

As you know, the Washington office has been concentrating much of its effort in the international area. However, we must find basic operating capital immediately. To this end, we have begun a four-phase program, which consists of an approach to large corporations which have contribution funds, to foundations, to institutes or foundations with similar goals to those of the NAEB, and, finally, to organizations with allied professional interests. These avenues should produce an adequate amount of basic operating capital within a relatively short period of time. I am convinced, however, that the most effective consistent way for the NAEB to finance not only its basic operations, but other desired expansion activities is by following through on the long-range programs already under way.

The value of some of the things already accomplished cannot have a price put on them: the basic research, the many contacts with representatives of the United States and foreign governments, the policy changes in many government agencies, the prestige and influence through the establishment of its Washington headquarters, and, most especially, NAEB's reputation as a "chosen instrument" nationally and internationally.

I am convinced that we are going to be able to not only serve our country and serve other countries of the world and mankind usefully, but that such service can result in developments which we can use to strengthen our organization, to do better all of the services we have previously done, and to take on a great many more that we have talked about as being needed in our discussions at this seminar.

COMMENT: I have thought about the disadvantage of the "N" in our name when it comes to international membership. If we were simply the Association of Educational Broadcasters, there would be no problem. There is some problem for individuals from other countries becoming members of the National Association of Educational Broadcasters of the U.S., whereas if we didn't mention it at all — if we called it the Association of Educational Broadcasters without reference to either national or international — there would be no handicap.

COMMENT: I think it's important and inevitable that we should be involved more than ever in international matters. And it seems to me that there are two approaches to this. One is to call ourselves the international organization of some kind; and if we do this we have to be truly international, which means that we have to admit people from both the East and West. The other approach is to call ourselves the Association of something or other and to admit members from other countries. And this is how the Society of Motion Picture Industries does it and does it very effectively. That is really an international organization in the sense that it has a good many members from foreign countries and the journal gets wide distribution overseas. And yet members can still be selective, if they wish, in what people they admit to membership. And this might be a better alternative — although if we want to be truly international, the other one does offer considerable opportunities.

COMMENT: I feel very strongly about the importance of increasing our international activities, but I certainly don't think we should destroy ourselves in the process. If you think you could internationalize the NAEB and then go before state legislatures and school boards or boards of control and get any support, you're sadly mistaken. The identity of this organization as the national organization is very important. And yet the other thing can be done, and it can be done in a number of ways — either by a subsidiary organization or by having an international division with international memberships. But let's don't destroy what we've been building up all these years.

COMMENT: Let's not change the name because this would do harm.

COMMENT: There will be 60 or 70 people representing 40 nations coming to Purdue University on the 8th of October for the International Conference on Instructional Television. And one of the problems that has bugged the planning group has been: So we bring them all here and we talk about this whole affair and we stir up a lot of interest, and then what? What happens? Do we form an informal society? Do we work in this area of internationalizing NAEB? Just what approach do we take? I don't think this is something we can bandy for very long. We're in some doubt about competition with the First International Assembly of the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences. The interest is tremendous. Evidently they planned for some 1,500 people to attend this meeting which was to be held the 4th to the 11th of November, 1961, only to find out a week ago that their advance information indicated that there would be over 3,000 people present at this session, and that there would be no place in the city of New York at this time where they could hold the whole session. So the whole idea has been postponed, more than likely for a year. There is tremendous pressure here. There is also pressure internally to take some leadership finally. The people who come from other countries with noncommercial broadcasting are not going to find the type of home that they want in the NAB or in the Academy.

COMMENT: There has been an informal query from UNESCO to NAEB to see what our interest would be in possibly enlarging our membership to provide this kind of home for international broadcasters.

QUESTION: Can't we provide this home without becoming the international association? We've tried like the deuce to become known as the national association that represents this country, and now we're going to represent the world?

ANSWER: Somewhere there should be a professional home for these people. In Germany, for example, the average station staff runs all the way from 400 in Bremen to 1,000 in Munich. These are people of extremely high level. These are the stations' staffs. They are people with the sort of qualifications that would provide an injection of high standards for our professional standards efforts. Within the next year or two, unless we do this, I think there will be organizations with an Iron Curtain orientation. It's become a source of concern to UNESCO. I don't know that we have to become this association; but I think that we have to consider it. The alternative might be to help in the formation of such an organization with our participating in it in some way. But this is where the leadership is; they turn to us. And believe me, this is an important problem. The type of membership we're talking about is individual only, and so maybe someone can come up with a way of reconciling this dilemma of becoming international without changing the name of the NAEB. I am sure that we would not want to be confronted with international membership of an institutional kind — that is, actives and associates and so forth. Associations are beginning to emerge which transcend national levels. The image of the NAEB is really a very shining image, and I think we should capitalize on it in some way.

COMMENT: There are surely other ways that we can accomplish these common objectives without changing NAEB's name — which, it has been pointed out here, would be harmful. And I think our aim ought to be not to say we're going to do it or not going to do it — we're going to do it — but to find a way to do it.

COMMENT: The easiest tack to fly would be to create an overseas membership category. For about fifteen years I have been a member of the Royal Photographic Society which has an overseas membership category. As such a member I have full voting rights; they send me the voting papers several months in advance; I get their journal regularly and any other publications that come out. When I go to England, I have the opportunity of using the facilities of the Society, of visiting members and seeing what they're doing in various places. And I certainly don't feel like a second-class citizen; I feel that I have a tie which gives me benefits both of new information and contacts, and I think that they would feel the same way about us. Certainly the term "Royal" indicates that it's not international; it's British. But a large number of their members are overseas; a large number are in the United States. And I think that a similar category might well serve the purpose here, and I think it would necessitate the smallest amount of change in our present structure.

COMMENT: I think we should give serious consideration to the possibility of perhaps doing away with the "National" term and open it up. We're talking about educational broadcasters, people who are coming together with a common interest in education through the medium of broadcasting. And we have put ourselves on record as saying that we are concerned with education in far corners of the world, including our own back yard, and we're devoting ourselves to this concern. And while we have some concern for education in the Sudan, I would expect that the Sudanese would have a little concern for education in North or South Dakota; in other words, these are the people we're talking about — not institutions, not governments, not this kind of involvement, but people who are concerned with education on this scale. And I hope that we can somehow work out a method whereby we can accept these kinds of memberships.

COMMENT: We have the problem here of international relations. We recognize the fact that we're going to have to be a part of the world order or we're not going to have any order at all. On the other hand, we have some very practical considerations, and we can't internationalize ourselves and at the same time continue to do business in the fifty United States on the same basis we're doing business now. We might as well face this. And if you think it won't make any difference in Washington, you're sadly mistaken, too. You don't know the senators and congressmen very well if you think this is so. We've got to retain our identity, and I should think that it would be the last thing that we'd want to do in this chaotic world at the present time and under the present circumstances to destroy our American identity. Now the Royal Photographic Society, which I think is an excellent example, has never in any way destroyed its English, or British, character. Everything that it publishes is in British terms. They're strictly

British in character. But all over the world they have members, and there's no reason in the world why we can't have international members, and there's no reason in the world why they can't be first-class citizens.

COMMENT: If we are going to turn leadership over to some other element, then they might as well take the leadership in the first place and we'll join that. If the NAEB has something in this thing that we have built that is going to be valuable to the whole world, then we have got to retain a certain amount of leadership of it. We've got to be the leader. So it's got to stem from here. This is a kind of thing where we cannot destroy ourselves and continue to be effective. We're effective because we are what we are. If we cease to be what we are, then we've become less effective.

Final Reports and Recommendations

Programs

Final Report and Recommendations

This group believes that the excitement, intellectual stimulation and new opportunities afforded by the NAEB's move to Washington should be reflected in a continuing emphasis on the NAEB Radio Network, on new methods of improving and distributing programs via the radio network, and on a full exploration of methods for obtaining, producing, and distributing certain categories of educational television programs as well.

This group reiterates the urgent need for a full-time vice president of NAEB in charge of programing. This individual would be located in Washington. His primary duty would be to program the NAEB Radio Network. Whether the tape distribution center remained in Urbana or was moved to Washington, the network manager would be responsible to the program vice president. The Radio Acceptance Committee would continue to operate, as it does now, in the evaluation and acceptance or rejection of network offerings. The first duty of the program vice president would be to improve and increase programs originating in Washington.

It is felt that the present arrangement of a part-time assistant in Washington responsible for programs originating there is unsatisfactory. Frequent turnover, the improbability of obtaining the highest calibre person for this position, and the increasing demands of such a position make it imperative that the present arrangement be considered only a stop-gap measure and not be allowed to become a permanent office in NAEB.

It is further recommended that the program vice president immediately make arrangements for the production and distribution of a regular television report from Washington. This assignment would be considered temporary, pending the development of a TV exchange or film network, if advisable. Eventually two full-time jobs, one for radio and one for television, could be anticipated and planned for.

The appointment of a program vice president is predicated upon the raising of funds as quickly as possible to support this position. We request that a report be made to the Radio Board at its October meeting by the president's office on the progress made toward realizing support for this appointment. We have been assured that the Radio Board will ask for this report. This group and the Radio Acceptance Committee stand ready to assist in formulating the requirements of this position in any way they can. If at the time of the October meeting, the judgment of the Board is that prospects for external financing of this position are unpromising, we urge that the Board instruct the Radio Planning Committee to (1) query all NAEB Active members (not just network members) on their willingness to contribute a set sum toward the support of this position; and (2) query all ETV stations as to their willingness to contribute a set sum toward the support of this position, in return for which ETV stations would receive the specially prepared TV Washington Report.

In the area of TV, other than the above Washington Report, this group suggests that the question of an exchange or networking of available TV programs be studied carefully, but as soon as possible, by those engaged in ETV production. This could be done either by a new committee or an existing committee at the discretion of the president. Such a project should not be plunged into without sober study but, in view of the evident opportunities and the resulting stimulation and service to NAEB's TV membership, the study should be made and a decision reached at the earliest opportunity. It is anticipated by this group that any TV production or distribution activity in which NAEB might engage would emphasize unique contributions not presently supplied from other sources based on present and developing relations between the NAEB office in Washington and various agencies in that city, particularly of government.

This group feels that the existence of regional radio and TV networks utilizing NAEB programing raises new problems which demand careful study by the NAEB Board. It seems obvious that NAEB programs should not be broadcast by non-NAEB stations on a regional network without compensation to NAEB. The terms under which such subsidiary uses via regional networks are permitted should be set forth explicitly for the benefit of the membership at large.

Professional Advancement

Final Report and Recommendations

Our group believes it essential to reiterate the fact that one of the chief concerns of the NAEB must be the welfare and development of educational broadcasting and its professional personnel. It must continue its efforts to develop the field of educational broadcasting into a generally recognizable discipline, recognized nationally and supported by a body of discipline. The NAEB must therefore clearly define its role in education and educational broadcasting, exerting its efforts to develop to the maximum the use of electronic media in education.

The document prepared by Vernon Bronson (dated July 3 with covering note by Harold Hill) succinctly states these needs and directions. Particularly pertinent are the suggestions of things the NAEB should do, as follows:

1. Seek institutional membership representation from the administrative heads of member institutions.

2. Publish a blue book of professional personnel.

3. Expand and re-examine its bimonthly Journal and other publications.

4. Employ a director of resource development, perhaps in connection with the implementation of the Burns' proposal.

5. Update and modify as necessary the national academy plan...under whatever label is desired, and make an effort to implement it item by item.

6. Press for the activation of the proposal for professional standards, now pending before the USOE.

7. Expand its publications and information services into an institutional press, distributing a wide range of professional and educational literature.

8. Establish a personnel counseling service and a station activation service, as one of the first items under the "academy" concept.

9. Carefully evaluate and explore all possibilities of the John Burns' proposal in the light of the spectrum needs survey report, drawing up a ten-year or some similarly designated plan.

10. Discuss with Burns of RCA and others from other corporations, proposals leading to more adequate support in the future.

11. In every way possible make special efforts to establish better working relationships with all other organizations in the field.

It was pointed out that there are different types of "professionalism." There are those professions which are licensed, like law or medicine. There are sub-groups of such professions, like those of technicians. The latter are more easily accredited because objective examinations testing technique skills can be used for testing. The educational broadcasting "profession" cannot be so easily handled.

It is agreed, however, that the profession we seek to create and define must demonstrate and dramatize respect for ethics and professional standards of practice. Skornia reported efforts some years ago to collect the statements of professional standards of some one hundred members of the Council of National Organizations. Most had no such statements. The rest were barely applicable. A few such organizations were in the same dilemma we are in, and asked us to tell them what we are able to develop.

Attention was called to the National Association of Accrediting Agencies which is an association of groups with the authority to accredit schools and programs. We visualize the NAEB not in the role of accrediting the instructional programs under which people are trained as much as in the role of setting standards for station staffs to apply at the present time.

The need to work with other groups was stressed. The proposal regarding such cooperation with the North Central Association, as an example, is given below.

Several years ago, Skornia's proposal to Kellogg for funds outlined the need to hold a national seminar with deans of schools of education, academic deans of universities, deans of liberal arts, superintendents of school systems and of public instruction, and presidents, to examine the beginnings that might be made to the establishment of such standards in a way which would win general administrative support. It is felt that many of them now are concerned about the need of such standards and professionalization, as the TV instructional field, particularly, is becoming more gigantic and, in some cases, disturbing, with many groups, including DAVI and others (some with accreditation status in their respective states), seeking to establish themselves in the role of "experts."

The proposal presently before the U. S. Office of Education would provide funds for such a seminar. It will also provide funds for the publication of the blue book mentioned above, the expansion of the scope of its publications and the starting of a personnel counseling service, including station activation. The need to continue to press for the approval of this proposal is therefore obvious.

It is essential that the NAEB coordinate with the various regional accrediting associations in the establishment of professional standards for utilization, transmission and reception, and subject-matter presentation.

In the initiation of this coordination, it is recommended that liaison be established by the NAEB with the various appropriate committees (TV where they exist; curriculum and others where there is no TV committee) of these associations. All efforts must also be made to make these liaison relationships permanent, keeping the NAEB as close as possible to the central core of American education.

Arrangements have already been made leading to the invitation of a representative of the NAEB to a planning session of the TV planning committee of the North Central Association, which is planning regional meetings. Expenses will be paid by the NCA. NAEB representation will insure closer liaison than has been possible in the past in a way which should be useful in many obvious respects.

Similar steps are recommended in contacts with the southern states and the other accrediting organizations of the U.S. It is urged and hoped that the NAEB, in this way, may eventually have a representative in each state, representing it, and reporting back on meetings and developments of each of the accrediting associations....

This example of the steps needed to win accrediting association support and assistance is typical of the multi-faceted approach which is essential.

Teacher and Educational Development

Final Report and Recommendations

This group believes that the major needs in this area could appropriately be classified into problems of presentation and utilization of classroom radio and television instruction. These needs were identified and the following recommendations made:

TEACHER TRAINING

NEED: Teachers requested to teach by television should be exposed to the experience of others who have used the medium, should be familiar with certain limitations and advantages of television presentation, and should be well enough informed about television teaching to explore and develop new techniques of teaching with this medium.

RECOMMENDATION: The NAEB should conduct a study of courses and materials which are now available in teachers' colleges and colleges of education. Publication of course outlines and evaluations of these courses would be helpful to institutions which do not yet present such courses and may result in the development of a suggested course outline to cover this subject.

TEACHER RIGHTS AND COMPENSATION

NEED: There is an important need, not only to develop appropriate systems for assuring proper treatment of teachers' rights, but to develop patterns in connection with suitable professional and legal counsel.

RECOMMENDATION: It is recommended that the NAEB work with the NEA, AAUP, AFT, ACE, legal counsel, and other appropriate groups to study and determine policies with respect to television teachers' residual rights, teaching load, and financial compensation. Members should be kept informed of existing practices and should be notified of the policies which this group establishes.

INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

NEED: A wide variety of resource materials produced by commercial firms is not currently available for showing on closed-circuit or open-circuit educational television systems. Efforts to alleviate this problem should be made.

RECOMMENDATION:	We recommend that the Program Committee consider this problem at its next meeting, and recommend to the Board that steps be taken to remove union, clearance, and copyright restrictions on the use of this material for classroom instruction by means of television. Where necessary, it should recommend steps for the establishment of reasonable royalty arrangements for the use of such material.

TRAINING OF ITV ADMINISTRATORS AND DIRECTORS

NEED:	The opportunity for instructional television administrators and directors to share problems and accomplishments is infrequent, and it is important that a national or regional system be established to provide for this on a regular basis.
RECOMMENDATION:	That special meetings of those involved as instructional television administrators and directors be convened at the NAEB Annual Conventions. To attract persons who would find such a meeting helpful, we further suggest that the NAEB compile a list of such persons and invite them to attend the 1961 convention.

UTILIZATION

NEED:	There persists a need to improve the utilization of television and radio teaching in the classroom. Because of a change of function during the television or radio presentation, many teachers have had difficulty accepting this modified role. A clearer understanding of the total process should provide a better over-all learning situation.
RECOMMENDATION:	It is recommended that the NAEB maintain a roster of competent personnel who could function as resource personnel in utilization workshops currently being conducted throughout the country.

FACILITIES FOR ORIGINATION AND RECEPTION OF ITV

NEED:	There is a need to gather together information about architectural needs in school and college buildings with respect to both origination and reception facilities.
RECOMMENDATION:	The NAEB should express its willingness to work with groups of architects and school planners, such as The National Association of School House Planners, to develop a file of this information, and to assist in future planning. It should further consider the possibility of bringing out a series of bulletins dealing with the facilities aspects of instructional television.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

NEED:	There is a need to inform the general public as to the developments and potentialities of instructional radio and television.
RECOMMENDATION:	The NAEB Public Relations Committee should consider this problem and give some thought to the possible use of television and radio as means of informing the public.

INTERNATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

NEED:	There is a need to train teachers, engineers, and production personnel to fill positions in newly developing countries. The overall need is to assist these countries in the establishment and use of instructional radio and television and in the training of their personnel.
RECOMMENDATION:	That the NAEB Committee on International Relations establish a directory of those member institutions which offer courses, on-the-job training, or visiting facilities for radio and television personnel from foreign countries.

TWO GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the respective roles of the Utilization and Instructional Television Committees be redefined as soon as possible.
2. In view of considerable developments of instructional television it is recommended that as soon as possible the NAEB appoint a full-time person to fulfill a coordination and liaison function in instructional radio and television — to work with teacher groups, professional teacher agencies, utilization personnel, and in-service teacher education projects.

Member Services

Final Report and Recommendations

It is the consensus of the seminar committee on member services that the keystones to improved member services can be identified as follows:

1. Communication between Association members and between members and Association officials.

2. Involvement of the membership in the affairs of the Association and its professional activities and interests. Such involvement strengthens the democratic base of the organization.

Communications Area:

1. Publications. There is need to review the intended audience of the Association's publications. Our publications need to know the audience being addressed. Our members themselves should know. Our publications should so state in every issue.

2. Services. There is need for a continual re-statement of the services currently available to the membership. Such services should constantly be called to the attention of the membership through all Association channels.

3. Reports. The committee feels that the Washington Report is effective, meets a need and should be continued. The committee recommends that the officers and Board instigate means of more rapid and effective communications with members. Such communication is particularly essential in the area of policy changes, such as those currently under consideration by the Board. An appropriate condensation of the final report of this seminar should be distributed to the entire membership. It is felt that there is need for the Association to undertake publication which could include complete texts of technical and nontechnical papers, proceedings of various Association meetings, regional meetings, other important media meetings, etc. The committee recommends the publication of a series of Association manuals on procedures, responsibilities, duties, etc. Such pieces could be directed to the Association member, the committee chairman, Board members, etc. It is also recommended that talks, panel discussions, and other presentations on the NAEB and its professional activities and interests be tape recorded and distributed to members. The techniques developed by the medical and dental professions in this area should be carefully studied.

Involvement:

1. Each NAEB region should hold a meeting of its regional members each year. This meeting should be held within the region and not in connection with a national convention, although the latter should not be discouraged as additional activity.

K/

2. It is recommended that the Board take such steps as necessary directly to involve at least one-quarter of the membership in the 1961 annual convention, on committees, panels, chairmanships, etc., and that this percentage of total membership so involved be increased each year.

3. It is recommended that the Board establish procedures to institute a series of awards in as many catagories as deemed appropriate, to be presented at the annual convention. The following are among those suggested: best program by low-powered radio, school licensee; best program by low-powered radio, college licensee; best program by high-powered radio, school licensee; best program by high-powered radio, college licensee; best program by an ETV station, school system assignee; best program by an ETV station, community assignee; best program by an ETV station, university assignee; teacher-of-the-year award, elementary level; teacher-of-the-year award, secondary level; teacher-of-the-year award, higher education; manager-of-the-year award, radio; manager-of-the-year award, television; production award, radio; production award, television; critic-of-the-year award; special awards.

4. The committee commends the president's procedure of establishing a rotational plan for committee membership. Wherever possible, at least one-third of each committee should be composed of members who have not served on a committee during the preceding three years. Every method of introducing new blood to the activities of the Association should be encouraged.

5. As another example of member involvement or participation, the Association might encourage the establishment of correspondence-type study groups which could (through such means as audiotapes, selected readings, etc.) conduct systematic study in the general area of broadcasting and communications, and in the specific areas of management, engineering, production, education, and evaluation.

In addition to the above, the committee feels the Association should give attention to the following:

1. Placement service. This member service should be publicized more to the membership and should be promoted via testimonials, news stories, and other means.

2. Routine inquiries. A better-informed membership via manuals as suggested previously, would allow referral of locally received inquiries to appropriate persons, thus reducing the headquarters load.

3. Radio network service. Information concerning scripts available from each program offering should be attached to each quarterly offering, as well as a listing of addresses for program inquiry referral. This will decrease headquarters routine correspondence. The continual listing of programs previously offered on the radio network, and still currently available for broadcast use, should be distributed regularly to all members.

4. Research material in Journal. The method by which research reports are published should be re-examined in the interest of improvement. The techniques developed by the IRE, SMPTE, and others in this area should be carefully studied.

Research Activities

Final Report and Recommendations

Educational broadcasting has at least two concrete reasons for being continuously involved in research. As broadcasters we are concerned with exploring our environment continuously to find ways of communicating more effectively. As educators we are concerned with the whole process of individual intellectual growth. Less concretely, we are communicators concerned with contributing to and benefiting from the growth of knowledge of communication processes. Whether we are to attain the status of professional broadcasters and educators depends in important part on our erecting a body of professional skills upon a substructure of systematic knowledge.

Research in educational broadcasting may be defined as any systematic method of intellectual inquiry, both pure and applied, whether historical, legal, humanistic or behavioral and quantitative, whatever method is appropriate to the knowledge sought.

Six specific steps are recommended:

1. To encourage member institutions in developing significant research programs, provide them with technical advice, and help them to establish relationships with research talent.

2. To perform a liaison function between and among member institutions desiring to share ideas, projects, talent and facilities, and between member institutions and organizations willing to support joint research efforts.

3. To compile and disseminate, under the leadership of the research committee, an inventory of the research needs of educational broadcasting.

4. To foster joint research efforts involving more than one member institution and where appropriate to be the applicant for research support in behalf of the membership.

5. To return to a policy of making direct research grants to members and member institutions.

6. To continue to disseminate research results through the Fact Sheets and to make the NAEB Journal increasingly a vehicle for reporting scholarly work.

Technical Services

Final Report and Recommendations

In view of pending government stimulation of ETV and the probable rapid future expansion of noncommercial broadcasting, this committee makes the following recommendations:

A. That the NAEB employ a staff engineering consultant and one or more assistant staff engineers; this engineer should be of comparable stature to those employed by the foremost engineering consultant firms in Washington. His responsibilities, and those of his staff, would be as follows:

1. To assist and advise educational agencies in the planning and formation of broadcast facilities and related activities. Of primary importance would be the preparation of a comprehensive planning handbook designed for the educational, state or municipal, administrator and other interested parties; this would contain a step-by-step approach to the rational development of a broadcast system suited to their needs. This handbook would contain such items as: basic and optional equipment requirements; descriptions and comparisons based on performance and cost of various types of equipment; explanations of procedures in meeting FCC applications (CP, test programing, proof of performance and licenses, etc.); FCC operating requirements; planning for future technical expansion; good technical operating procedures; recommendations of the types and salary structure of competent technical personnel required for different types of operations. This handbook might be accompanied by a motion picture designed to clarify certain key points.

2. To act as consultant to educational network organizations.

3. To act as NAEB liaison with the FCC engineers and to keep the membership advised of all new FCC technical requirements.

4. To advise the NAEB on any pending legislation related to technical matters and to promote such legislation as the NAEB decides to support with the appropriate agency.

5. To survey present technical standards set by various organizations and to present his recommendations on these and proposed additional standards to the NAEB; to act as NAEB representative in organizations dealing with broadcast standards, e.g. the EIA.

6. To keep NAEB members informed of all technical and equipment advances by a suitable publication or memorandum.

7. To initiate, evaluate, and originate NAEB technical reports, research and surveys intended for the membership or for governmental agencies.

8. To investigate and implement a long-range recruitment and in-service training

program for technical personnel and the origination, compilation, and distribution of materials suitable for such purposes; to originate and develop engineering seminars and to encourage the loaning of technical personnel by the commercial networks and their affiliates to new noncommercial stations as consultants and workshop leaders.

9. Maintenance of all NAEB technical equipment.

B. The present Engineering Committee would continue to function in the following capacities:

1. To act as a liaison between the NAEB membership and the engineering staff.

2. To act as editorial board for the proposed handbook, subsequent additions to it, and other major technical reports to the membership.

3. To recommend survey and research needs in the technical area.

4. To promote and assist in developing training programs, workshops, and technical seminars.

5. To implement and promote an increased representation of engineering personnel in the NAEB membership.

Publicity and Public Relations

Final Report and Recommendations

Recognizing the importance of public relations and publicity both within the organization and in acquainting the public with goals and achievements of the NAEB, this committee recommends that action be taken in the following areas:

MAILING

1. NAEB headquarters should send regional mailing lists to regional directors; they should review the lists and make additions or changes; the revised lists would then be returned to headquarters. Regional directors should receive duplicate addressograph plates for regional promotional purposes.

Implementation: Refer to headquarters staff for action.

MEMBERSHIP REPRESENTATION

1. NAEB should be officially registered and represented at national and regional broadcasting and educational conventions in the following manner: president, vice president, or chairman of the board; regional directors; committee chairmen; committee members; membership.

a. Participation in panels, discussions, workshops, and presentations of the above conventions by NAEB delegates should be actively pursued.

b. Delegates should also be responsible for placing an NAEB display and distributing NAEB literature.

c. Increased participation in state or local broadcast and educational organizations and groups by NAEB members should be encouraged.

d. Attempts should be made to secure invitations from these organizations to leading NAEB representatives as guest speakers.

e. Local displays highlighting local broadcasting and NAEB activities should be developed.

Implementation: On the national level by headquarters staff; on the regional and local level, with the cooperation of the regional directors.

2. Survey the feasibility of involving various service organizations to a greater degree on behalf of developing and existing radio and TV stations in the following areas:

public relations and promotional work; underwriting of station-produced programs; participation in program production; utilization of station facilities in conjunction with their national and regional conferences (when appropriate).

MEMBERSHIP RECRUITMENT

1. Station managers and members representing educational institutions should be encouraged to delegate some member of their staff to: orient the staff as to NAEB functions and services, etc.; distribute NAEB materials, follow up with NAEB recruitment; act as feed-back channel from the individual members of the NAEB on publications and services.

In addition they might ensure that those persons on their staff engaged in speeches, workshops, etc., would be advised to refer to the NAEB whenever appropriate, and to distribute NAEB materials together with any station or other literature that they use to promote both local and national educational broadcasting activities.

Implementation: Memo prepared by staff outlining suggested action to the managers from the regional directors.

PROMOTIONAL TAPES AND FILMS

1. Production of radio and TV spot announcements and programs intended to acquaint the audience with the role and developments of NAEB, its members, and educational broadcasting in general, designed to be used by commercial as well as educational broadcast stations.

2. Production of a series of promotional films which would tell the story of educational broadcasting and of the NAEB to community and educational organizations; these films would be used both by groups interested in developing a new facility or by existing stations in order to promote greater utilization and development.

Implementation: Survey the need for and appropriate content of such a series.

3. Headquarters should delegate members to contact the networks in order to suggest NAEB participation in panel, interview, and documentary treatments of educational broadcasting, instructional utilization, international developments, etc. Thus capitalizing on the existing network public-affairs type programs, current interest in TV programing, educational needs, and our international relations.

a. Regional directors or individual station managers should do the same thing on the local level in cooperation with the commercial stations in their area.

NAEB PROGRAM REVIEW SERVICE

In view of the inadequate critical coverage of local noncommercial and commercial public-affairs programs, or even of national programs of merit, in the syndicated "TV highlights" columns carried in most newspapers; and in view of the current interest in the upgrading of programing; and the public support given these programs that are clearly of superior calibre, the committee makes the following proposal:

1. That the NAEB seek to establish NAEB reviewers in two or three major production areas who would preview both network and syndicated programs, commercial and noncommercial, and write intelligent, lively, and stimulating reviews of such programs which would be sent to the NAEB publications editor.

2. Such review would then be distributed on a weekly basis to member stations and the station's publicity director would add reviews or highlights of outstanding local programs, again both commercial and noncommercial, and would prepare a weekly column.

3. Local newspapers would have to be approached in advance to secure their cooperation in providing space for such an NAEB program review which should eventually provide a continuing service to the viewer and the broadcasting industry in general, under the auspices of NAEB.

It is suggested that such a service be started on a modest scale with perhaps two national reporters located in New York and Hollywood; and that one area be selected where both an ETV station and an NAEB radio member were operating in order to test the feasibility and response to this proposal. Funds to initiate such a limited test program might be obtained from NAB through its Television Information Office.

PUBLICATIONS

1. The NAEB History should be updated.

Implementation: An NAEB member should be designated to assign this as an M.A. thesis and subsequently submit it to the NAEB editor for publication and distribution.

a. An abstract of the entire history should be prepared for mass distribution.

2. The publication of a promotional handbook together with a promotional "kit."

a. The handbook would consider guidelines for mounting radio and TV promotional campaigns using all media and community resources.

b. The kit would contain the best examples of continuity, posters, brochures, artwork, etc., compiled from member stations and circulated among them; additional material could be added from time to time.

Implementation: Refer to Public Relations Committee.

CONVENTION ACTIVITIES

1. Equipment manufacturers displaying at the NAEB convention should be contacted by the convention committee to determine whether they would be willing to provide photographic coverage of the conventioneers for NAEB publicity purposes (as well as their own).

2. The appropriate representatives of the NAB and other broadcast, educational, and government organizations should be sent NAEB convention literature and a letter of invitation.

3. The convention committee should attempt to involve at least one-quarter of the membership in convention activities.

4. Consideration should be given to a convention panel consisting, for example, of a leading public relations representative from one of the NAEB member stations; a leading university or school system public relations representative; a leading researcher or practitioner of advertising and public relations; a leading commercial station or network public relations representative.

NAEB LOGO

The public relations committee should initiate a competition among member stations or educational institution art departments to design a new NAEB logo which would be incorporated in the following: Letterheads and publications; microphone logos; an NAEB pin to be sold to members at conventions.

NATIONAL ADVERTISING CAMPAIGN

Investigation should be conducted of expenses involved in National Advertising Council Campaign.

PUBLIC RELATIONS DIRECTOR

This committee recommends that efforts be made to employ a full-time public relations director who would coordinate many of the above functions and be responsible for promoting NAEB in all media on the national level.

Promotional Development and Activation

Final Report and Recommendations

I. Activation for purposes of this report shall be deemed to include (1) activation of both radio and television stations (2) the interconnection of these (3) the activation of closed-circuit installations and production centers and (4) the activation of translators, repeaters, and allied auxiliary devices for facilitating broadcasting.

II. It is the firm conviction of the authors of this report that assistance to activation is a primary duty of the NAEB.

III. It is believed the the NAEB can and should aid in activation in many ways. Among these methods should be the preparation of three manuals.

A. A manual for use by academic personnel should include:

1. Statements as to ways by which instruction and its quality may be improved at the elementary, secondary, and collegiate levels by the use of electronic media. The vast quantity of research data available to support these statements should be brought to the attention of the academic community.

2. The academic community should be advised as to proven methods of using the electronic media which will, or can, result in more preparation time for teachers, cooperative planning for better teaching, re-structuring of class loads, more efficient use of teacher time, better teaching through use of the "team teaching" approach.

B. A manual for use by those able to support activation financially (including legislators, foundation executives, business leaders, and top educational administrators).

1. Statements showing the pro-rata costs of electronic instruction as compared to other instructional costs.

2. Statements as to actual and potential economies made possible through the electronic media in building construction, building maintenance, direct instructional costs, more efficient use of existing physical plant, more efficient use of staff (recording), availability of more qualified teachers for counseling, guidance, remedial teaching, library services, and supervision.

3. A statement of actual examples of financial savings effected by use of television — Dade County (Florida) schools, University of Houston, Twin City area (Spanish), Nebraska high schools, Oklahoma schools.

4. A list of teaching school systems and colleges now using the electronic media in order to save costs while improving instruction.

5. A statement that in a very few instances the media have been misused with less than ideal results but that in each case the NAEB is prepared to state what the misuse was and what can be done to avoid any repetition of such mistakes. NAEB welcomes the opportunity to render this service.

C. A manual for use by parents and other citizens interested in education.

1. Parents (and other taxpayers) must be informed that by full use of the electronic media the children of their area can receive the best possible education, at no increase in cost, and quite possibly some savings can be realized.

2. Parents and others should be informed as to the ways in which use of the electronic media in teaching improves the quality of education, can bring the world to the classroom, can bring authoritative persons to the classroom, can bring the above advantages economically whereas these advantages cannot be brought to the classroom in any other way whatever.

3. Parents should be informed also that the use of the electronic media allows them to share the school experience of their children.

4. Parents should also be informed that by the use of the media they can observe the schools in action and hence can convince the public of the need to support excellence in education.

IV. We believe the NAEB should maintain active liaison with other organizations (even including the NETRC) to encourage activation.

V. We recommend that the NAEB support positively local, state, and regional efforts toward activation (including interconnection) by all available means including the encouragement and support of all engaged in this effort.

VI. We recommend a great increase in legislative lobbying by the NAEB at all levels and a frank avowal by the NAEB that it is doing this lobbying in order to further the aims and purposes of education.

VII. We recommend that the NAEB exhort all classes of its membership to consider work toward activation as one of its primary duties and to consider that support of the NAEB in this function is likewise essential.

VIII. We recommend that the NAEB search diligently for funds to support the activation efforts of its members.

IX. We commend and encourage international efforts in activation.

X. We recommend the extension of efforts to establish an effective relationship between NAEB and the FCC to the end that activation should be encouraged.

XI. We recommend that maximum use be made of the recently completed spectrum study by all concerned with activation.

XII. Finally, we recommend the establishment by the NAEB of an office of vice president (of the NAEB) for development and activation as soon as necessary funds for this objective can be obtained.

Policy Guidance and Direction

Final Report and Recommendations

Our committee addressed ourselves specifically to: (1) the formulation of policy and (2) to its articulation and dissemination. The committee noted that it had been the victim of a semantic confusion with respect to policy as distinct from the philosophy on which policy is built. Thus we have the matter of a broad philosophy -- the whole business of aims, goals, principles, objectives, the "social contact," or in other words our constitutional base, if you please. Then there is the matter of policy per se — the ways and means of specifically implementing and interpreting and developing these broader objectives. Therefore, the committee thought we might try to look a little at where we are — where we have been and where we are going — in terms of philosophy and policy.

In 1926 when the NAEB was first formed, and thereafter up to the first Allerton House seminar, it was primarily a self-help organization. Everybody was in broadcasting. The kinds of broadcasting and the kinds of educational purposes pursued were many and diverse. The common denominator was the concept of self-help and some kind of feeling of obligation and conscience that these instruments of communications should be devoted to something more than entertainment, that they had potential for education and we as educational broadcasters had a special custodianship to fulfill. These attitudes took the form, then, of a national projection and, even at that time, of seeking reserved channels for radio, a national network program service, and a national headquarters. However, until Allerton House there was comparatively little sophistication achieved in spelling out the kinds of national goals, though they were thought to be implicit in the national picture.

At Allerton House, a seminar held in the days before television, considerable progress was made in spelling out the NAEB's broad philosophy of service and program obligations, within the radio framework.

After Allerton House came television, a new technological force that changed the whole educational broadcasting environment and likewise altered the nature and direction of what we felt was our broad social base, our broad obligations, our broad philosophy; and it made some resultant changes in policy.

At this moment we find ourselves not only with all of the changes television brought about, but with a whole new international involvement which will not only change policy, but may change our basic philosophical concept of our role as educational communicators.

A second element, which may have the same effect, is the new and evolving technology of communications, ranging now from radio and television to the teaching machine and the other new electronic artifacts.

For nearly half a century the NAEB has been a mosaic of institutions and individuals each with separate and often different local or regional educational objectives. Thus far, the organizational common denominator has rested on the base of institutional ownership and use of broadcast communications facilities, and in the belief that these radio and television instruments have special significance in the pursuit of educational goals, and in the conviction that education has special obligations with respect to their use. However, there is no common denominator of agreement on the kind of applications and the use.

These elements found expression in a mutual professional association built on the democratic tradition and on a national basis with the expectation that therein lay the greatest potential for local and regional improvement in educational communications.

Now the committee suggests the time has come for a re-examination of our philosophical position. This week we've begun this task in somewhat the same terms as those of Allerton House. But we believe we have to fully understand this new environment, the nature and the directions of this new technological and international environment, before we can appropriately develop new or change existing policy.

We suggest again the distinction between the broad philosophical base, to which we've been committed, and policy as a procedure or ways and means of interpreting that broad base. You change A and inevitably you change B. So we think a period of study is indicated to find out how fundamental this apparent change in technological environment really is or whether these new artifacts represent variations on old themes.

In any event, the policy committee takes this position — that the committee itself does not want to be, or pretend to be a maker of policy. We believe that this is the function of the elected Board, and that the Board's basic function is to establish and interpret policies. The process of democratic free election is that process whereby the membership can get rid of a Board if it doesn't like its operations in the policy field. The committee, therefore, recommends to the Board that its president and its members undertake to prepare a comprehensive statement which would stipulate what we conceive our present policies to be. This new document would constitute one part of the study.

We suggest further that the Board consult with someone like James Finn, who under an NDEA grant has probably made a more comprehensive exploration of the new technology in education than anyone else, to insure that the Board in its efforts doesn't duplicate data search. We suggest that special attention be given international developments to see how this determines the new environment. We recommend that this study begin now and be completed on or before this calendar date next year. When the study is completed, it should be reviewed by the Board. Then if recommendations for new and refined policy — and indeed a new and different philosophical base — are indicated, such recommendations should be made for submission to the membership. In any event, the results of the studies should be available in one handbook, discussed by another committee.

It occurred to us that as a part of this review (and indeed as continuing vehicle for the Board) our various committee chairmen through our total committee structure might themselves undertake to state what they believe goals and policy are within the context of each committee and refer these statements to the Board. This might well be the first step in the study and a useful continuing piece of policy device in the future.

Financial Support

Final Report and Recommendations

Your committee feels that in the future the NAEB should and can best look for its financial support from professional services rendered. The day of sustaining grants seems to be fast disappearing. However, even with its changing financial pattern, the NAEB is wisely broadening its horizon of service and widening its scope of responsibility. This new outlook calls for funds on a scale never before contemplated. There is a need for additional personnel, larger quarters, new facilities, and more operational funds.

Funds for this increased responsibility are necessary now.

The following recommendations are made in the light of the above-mentioned new vistas:

1. Continuation of the present NAEB leadership.

2. Putting into effect immediately the president's proposed crash program.

3. Expanding and extending NAEB membership by means of revising upward institutional memberships, and establishing new categories of memberships.

International Relations

Final Report and Recommendations

This group advocates increased emphasis on the role of the NAEB in the international communications field. As a first step it is suggested that consideration be given to some provision for admitting to membership individual broadcasters of other nations. This is believed by most members of the group to be the simplest and most effective way of providing a professional home for broadcasters around the world. However, other alternatives to the opening up of individual membership to foreign broadcasters were also discussed. They include (1) the establishment of a new international association, to the formation of which NAEB would lend its best efforts, (2) changing the name of NAEB to AEB, (3) changing the name of NAEB to IAEB, (4) creation of a separate category of membership for foreign broadcasters.

It is felt that the status of individual membership for foreign broadcasters, as initially proposed above, adequately insures against endangering the status of NAEB as a trade association, particularly in legislative and other official contacts. It should be remembered that the vote of individual members is restricted to the selection of an individual member director as a member of the Board.

It is felt that the benefits accruing to U.S. broadcasters by this move would be (1) the exchange of ideas and information with foreign broadcasters, including new materials from abroad for publication, (2) assistance in an enlarged program exchange with foreign countries, (3) additional financial income from new members, and (4) increased prestige for the NAEB at large. The benefits to foreign broadcasters would be primarily a professional home for such individuals who presently lack such an organization, and assistance to foreign broadcasters when they visit this country.

This group endorses moves under way to make the NAEB the principal agency in the U.S. for programing the visits of foreign broadcasters to this country.

The group further approves a move to create through the NAEB, in cooperation with the Office of Education or other agency, a comprehensive list of individuals, carefully screened and accredited, who could serve as consultants in both foreign and domestic service at the request of government and the NAEB.

The group gives wholehearted approval to the present activities of the NAEB in the field of foreign technical assistance.

The group expressed its appreciation of the services of the Checchi Company in the development of contacts in government and industry here and overseas.

The group agrees that the proper committee of NAEB to handle the development and procurement of programs from overseas is the Program Acceptance Committee working in cooperation with the network manager. It is hoped that any officer or representative of NAEB will stimulate such exchange or procurement of foreign programs whenever possible, again in cooperation with the network manager and the acceptance committee.

Liaison with all Branches of Government

Final Report and Recommendations

This group commends the excellent liaison and contacts which the president and headquarters staff have established and developed during this past year with the various branches of government. Particular tribute should be paid to the president and the International Relations Committee for outstanding progress and achievement in the field of international education, and the role of leadership which the Association has taken in this area of most critical need. We recommend that this liaison and activity be given top priority for direct and vigorous action by the NAEB, now and in the immediate future.

In addition, we recommend the following program of new and continued government and related agency liaison:

1. The purpose of the NAEB in its contacts with Congress and the FCC should be to inform, instruct, define, clarify, and assist. Under no conditions should the Association lobby or become identified as a lobbying organization. Positions on legislation affecting education and educational broadcasting should be pursued in open hearings where evidence and testimony can be properly submitted. The Association should poll the membership for information concerning individual and institutional contacts with members of Congress and Congressional committees. The Association then can request and enlist membership aid in support of desirable legislation.

2. The purpose of the NAEB in its contacts and liaison with other government agencies and branches should be to actively pursue whatever educational and educational broadcasting goals, objectives, and values are determined by the administrative staff, the Board, and the membership to be in the best interests of our Association and our nation. No restriction should be placed upon the Association in the fulfillment of these objectives.

3. The NAEB should cooperate with the JCEB, NETRC, NEA, USOE, and other organizations and agencies interested in educational broadcasting, in developing and maintaining liaison and contacts with the various branches of government. However, the NAEB should represent its own interests and membership at all times, in its own name, and in its own rights.

4. All liaison with Congress and government agencies should be made by and through the president or his duly designated representative. Such contacts must be effective and of the highest order. They require experience and professional ability. We recommend that a new position be authorized to provide the president with the assistance that will be required. The function of this position will be to handle the details, arrangements, and authorized representation for the president necessary to his carrying out of this responsibility. We recommend also that this liaison and these contacts be extended to the working professional agency staffs and personnel. The strongest foundation for the realization of Association purposes and goals over the years probably can be built at these permanent professional staff levels.

5. The NAEB should recommend to the FCC the re-activation of a special unit within the Commission which would devote itself to the engineering and legal problems and needs of the educational stations, and to the rules and regulations governing educational broadcasting.

6. The NAEB should place all Commissioners and selected members of the staff, and all key members of other government branches and agencies, on the permanent mailing list to receive copies of the Journal and other selected Association publications. In addition, the NAEB should sponsor special studies, and make special informational releases, for distribution to Congress and the various government agencies.

The success of the first year of the Association headquarters in Washington has been phenomenal. We predict continued progress and outstanding achievements in the future. We urge the full support of the membership to its officers in the development of their relationships with government.

participants

Vernon Bronson, 7400 Grove Avenue, Kendall, Miami 56, Florida.

*R. Edwin Browne, Director, Stations KFKU and KANU, ESS Building, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas.

*Richard S. Burdick, Managing Director, WHYY, 1622 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pennslvania.

E. G. Burrows, Manager, WUOM, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Dr. Lee S. Dreyfus, Assistant Director of Broadcasting, WDET (FM), Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

Dr. Walter B. Emery, Department of Radio-TV, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

James A. Fellows, Executive Secretary, Empire State School of the Air, Radio Center, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

*Albert P. Fredette, Station Manager, WAMC (FM), 47 New Scotland Avenue, Albany, New York.

Dr. Larry Frymire, Manager, Radio Station WKAR, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

*Leslie P. Greenhill, Associate Director, Division of Academic Research and Services, 405 Old Main Building, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania.

*William G. Harley, NAEB President, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

Harold E. Hill, Administrative Vice President, NAEB, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington 6, D.C.

*Richard B. Hull, Director, Radio and TV Broadcasting, Ohio State University, 215 W. 19th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio.

Dr. Armand Hunter, Director of Broadcasting, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan.

*Raymond D. Hurlbert, General Manager, Alabama Educational TV Commission, 807 Protective Life Building, Birmingham, Alabama.

*Ken Kager, Operations Manager, Station KUOW, 325 Communications Building, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Harry D. Lamb, General Manager, Greater Toledo ETV Foundation, 1901 W. Central Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

Jack G. McBride, Director of ETV, Station KUON-TV, University of Nebraska, Lincoln 8, Nebraska.

H. B. McCarty, Director, WHA, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

Mrs. Betty McKenzie, NAEB Publications Editor, 119 Gregory Hall, Urbana, Illinois.

*Carl H. Menzer, Station Director, WSUI, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

*James S. Miles, Director, WBAA, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.

Thomas Petry, Production Manager, WQED, 4337 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh 13, Pennsylvania.

*Dr. John C. Schwarzwalder, General Manager, Twin City Area Educational Television Corporation, KTCA-TV, St. Paul 8, Minnesota.

*Dr. Harry J. Skornia, Associate Professor of Radio and Television, 24 Gregory Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

*Loren B. Stone, Manager, KCTS-TV, University of Washington, Seattle 5, Washington.

Dr. Bruce H. Westley, School of Journalism, University of Wisconsin, Madison 6, Wisconsin.

Invited but did not attend:

Dr. Samuel L. Becker, Director, Division of Television, Radio, Film, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

Robert Blakeley, Dean of Extension Division, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

*Dr. Kenneth A. Christiansen, Director of Television, School of Journalism and Communications, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

*Roy Flynn, Director, University Broadcasting Services, Station WFSU-FM, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida.

Hartford N. Gunn, Jr., General Manager, WGBH-FM and TV, 84 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge 39, Massachusetts.

*Howard L. Johnson, Executive Director, KRMA-TV, Denver Public Schools, 12th and Welton Streets, Denver, Colorado.

Keith Nighbert, Manager, Station WENH-TV, University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire.

Dr. Edward Rosenheim, Faculty Exchange, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Illinois.

Robert Schenkkan, Director, Radio/Television, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

Frank Schooley, Director, University Broadcasting, 227 Gregory Hall, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

*NAEB Board members.

Appendix

NAEB HEADQUARTERS
1346 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D.C.

General Background Information for 1961 Seminar

Preface — This is a seminar devoted to the NAEB itself — a scrutiny of what it is, what it ought to become, and how to get there. Circumstances that gave the organization birth are not the same. How can we shape NAEB so that it is competent to meet the challenges of today while still adhering to basic principles — our faith in the educational-cultural benefits of the electronic media and concern that they be responsibly used by qualified personnel so as to fully realize their potential in the service of our society and mankind.

General Approach — The seminar will examine the present three-fold function of the NAEB (trade association, professional association, and network) and consider whether or not what the NAEB is doing in each of these three areas is valid and whether or not the NAEB should be involved in all three.

In this connection the seminar should proceed to consider the following:

1. If any given function is valid, then is it being performed adequately, and if it is not being performed adequately, how may performance in this area be improved?

2. If any given function is not a valid one for the Association to perform, how may this function be disposed of without injury to the NAEB or injury to the profession as a whole?

3. Are there any other valid functions the NAEB ought to perform? If so, why are we not doing so, and how do we implement the performance of such functions?

4. Based on the outcome of the discussions of the three points above, what kind of structure should the NAEB have or build for the future? What should be our ultimate objectives in the way of services to the whole educational broadcasting field in general and the NAEB in particular, and how may these objectives be most expeditiously achieved?

Background — In December, 1957, the NAEB Board of Directors, together with several others invited to attend, met in Chicago for a "self-evaluation" session, with purposes similar to those of this seminar. As we re-examine our status, role, goals, etc., nearly four years later, it will be well to keep in mind some of the major items discussed at the Chicago meeting.

The consensus of the Chicago group was that educational broadcasting has ten major areas of need:

1. Programs
2. Professional advancement
3. Teacher and educational development
4. Member services
5. Research activities
6. Technical services
7. Publicity and public relations
8. Promotional development and activation
9. Policy guidance and direction
10. Financial support

Two other areas should be added to the original ten as a result of recent trends:

11. International relations

12. Liaison with all branches of government

These 12 areas of need, most of which fit into the three-fold function of the NAEB, should each be considered by the seminar as outlined in the "General Approach" above. Others may be added, of course, by seminar participants. The present activities of the NAEB in each of the ten areas listed above follow.

I Programs — Following more than a year's discussion and negotiation, the membership voted at the 1960 convention in San Francisco not to transfer the NAEB Radio Network to the NETRC — at least for the present. Therefore, the Association leadership has proceeded on the assumption that the NAEB will continue to operate a Network, at least for the foreseeable future, and has attempted to improve the Network service in several ways.

New Ampex duplicating equipment was purchased, to supplement the multi-channel duplicators already in use, and another Ampex unit (or possibly two) will be added. New equipment is being used for duplication of network programs containing music and, due to the high speed of Ampex duplication, for filling special orders. The multi-channel duplicators must still be used for most programs until we can purchase enough Ampex equipment to assume the entire process. The new equipment has permitted the "cannibalizing" of one of the multi-channel duplicators, thus allowing us to completely rebuild the remaining one. This has resulted in much higher quality reproduction by this equipment. This system, in addition to its obvious benefits, should encourage a new rise in network affiliation among stations previously reticent about joining the Network until the technical quality of our programs improved.

Network membership during the past year rose to a new high: 97 affiliates operating 118 transmitters. Many of the newer affiliates are small FM stations who, because of limited funds for programming, would be severely handicapped without NAEB Network service.

In recent months, the Network has taken advantage of the new Washington Headquarters, and is distributing "Washington Report" (weekly series of fifteen-minute programs of background and commentary) and "Special of the Week" (weekly series of thirty-minute talks and interviews).

Since Center funds for financial assistance in the production of new series were no longer available, the NAEB this year, for the first time, undertook to finance with its own funds a limited Grant-in-Aid program.

The Network continues to distribute numerous programs from other nations. During this past year programs have been aired from France, Canada, Israel, Italy, Mexico, Sweden, and West Germany. NAEB programs are also used by the Voice of America and by other arms of the USIA.

To help underwrite these new services and equipment, at least partially, Network fees were increased by 20% as of July 1, 1961, and a new method of providing programs for the basic fee is being instituted this fall to reduce wasted duplication efforts.

II Professional Advancement — In recent years the NAEB has not been able to carry on the extensive professional development activities possible when funds for this purpose were made available by the FAE and the Ford Foundation. However, it has been possible, from funds provided in the operating budget (partially supported by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation), to hold at least one seminar each summer. This current seminar is the last one which will be possible under the current arrangement, since Kellogg support ceases as of June 30, 1962.

Last year a small grant was received from the Blonder-Tongue Foundation for two modest scholarships to permit advanced study by two educational TV broadcasters. It then appeared that this cooperation with the Blonder-Tongue Foundation could be expanded in coming years. However, the Foundation has changed its area of emphasis and no longer has funds available for such purposes.

An NAEB professional development proposal is currently being considered by the United States Office of Education for a possible contract under the National Defense Education Act. This project, if approved, would provide funds to enable the NAEB to (1) Survey and determine professional standards, (2) compile a comprehensive inventory of professional personnel, and (3) establish a program of recruitment and professional training.

III Teacher and Educational Development — In this area little has been done since the seminars on utilization of radio and television were held a few years ago in which representatives of teacher-training institutions were involved. A contract from the USOE permitted Clair Tettemer (Chairman, NAEB Subcommittee on Television Utilization) to develop a pilot "utilization kit" designed to show classroom teachers how they might best utilize television. This kit was demonstrated at the San Francisco convention and again at the IERT this spring. Plans are to submit a proposal to the USOE for another grant for expansion of this project, in which case a library of utilization materials would be developed and made available by the NAEB. NAEB publications have attempted, through pertinent articles, to provide some help in this area, but these efforts are limited at best. How the NAEB may be more effective in this area is a valid question to be considered by this seminar.

IV Member Services — This is a general area which includes many of the others. Nearly all of the 12 areas of need fall within the general category of "Member Services." However, certain specific items should be pointed out. The staff handles hundreds of routine inquiries each year from institutional and individual members who are seeking advice and information on a limitless variety of subjects. The NAEB operates a Placement service (which also falls in the area of professional advancement) to assist individual members in finding positions and to help institutional members find qualified employees. This service has been growing gradually in recent years and numerous members have been placed in educational broadcasting jobs.

The two regular NAEB publications, the Newsletter and the Journal, are "member services." These publications go to all institutional and individual members, bringing them timely articles about the field as well as important announcements and information about their association. In addition, a "Washington Report" is published at monthly (shorter when the news warrants) intervals to enable the membership to keep abreast of important developments in the nation's capital, such as important FCC (and other governmental agency) rulings and decisions, progress of pertinent legislation, etc.

Items 11 and 12 — International Relations and Liaison with all branches of government — also fall under "member services," are covered more in detail in Item 8, below, and separately in the proper sequence.

New situations constantly arise where the NAEB might be of service, but is not now in a position to be of much material help. For example, budgetary problems in the state of Michigan have resulted in a reduction in funds to educational stations at state institutions. Could, and/or should, the NAEB be of any assistance (through contacts with the university presidents, etc.) in situations such as this?

In this light it is extremely important to determine just exactly what can be done with present resources and staff, and what emphasis we want to establish. It is important to keep in mind that if we are to institute any new services or projects we must have the necessary staff to do the job properly, otherwise we will continue to spread ourselves thinner and thinner and not be capable of doing a creditable job in any given area. A determination must be made of which projects and services are the most important to carry out if our resources remain constant and then concentrate on doing an excellent job in those areas. Each time a new project or service is considered we must keep in mind that it will have to replace something currently being done unless added staff and funds are available to undertake the new project. Services have been expanded considerably in recent years without any appreciable increase in staff, and none at the administrative level where most of the burden of new projects falls.

We must also realize that many services now being performed are not of such nature as to be immediately recognized by the membership as valuable. Many present activities (legislative, liaison with governmental agencies, international activities, cooperation with related organizations, etc.) are of long-range benefit to the entire educational broadcasting movement, but are not always concrete enough, or immediate enough, for the membership to perceive how it is being helped. It is for this reason, primarily, that, while services to members have actually increased in recent years, it has been difficult to justify, in the minds of the membership, a dues increase which would enable us to continue and expand these various activities. The increased services brought about by the establishment of the Washington office are a specific example. This move has resulted in greatly increased costs, and should be offset by an increase in dues, but the services are not immediately enough evident to permit asking the membership for more money.

In fact, because of the factors enumerated above, the membership often seems to feel that they are paying dues to an association that is not really providing services which are "worth the money." The membership must be made to realize that all of these activities will help them in the long run and that this is the only way the association can grow and develop into the type of organization they all hope for. These new activities help bring recognition to the association, and thus to educational broadcasting, thus the entire membership will profit in the long run and educational broadcasters will get a more sympathetic reception from their institutional administration, bigger budgets, better audience reception, etc.

It is important that this seminar suggest ways the staff (and other NAEB leadership) can clarify this concept for the membership.

The NAEB as a national organization cannot grow any bigger than its constituency. All efforts to increase the stature of the educational broadcasting movement will be to no avail unless we are able (through the sort of activities outlined above) to increase the stature of member institutions and individuals. As they grow, due to the combined efforts of all, they will be in a position (financially and influentially) to support the association in continuing efforts at growth and expansion of activities and services.

V Research Activities — The major research project undertaken recently is the survey of TV spectrum needs of education which is covered in more detail in item 8 below (Promotional Development and Activation). No other extensive survey projects have been undertaken. However, the membership is still served through the Research Fact Sheets which appear in the Journal. These digests of pertinent research are the best single available source of information about research in the field. In addition, the staff is frequently able to offer advice and suggestions to persons undertaking research in the educational broadcasting field, and to refer members to existing research findings which will be helpful to them in solving some of their problems.

VI Technical Services — Since the expiration of Ford Foundation funds which provided for the employment of a fulltime NAEB engineer, the Association has been unable to provide technical services to any great extent. The Engineering Committee has been extremely helpful in a great many instances, and has done more than could normally be expected of a voluntary group. However, it is impossible for this Committee to provide the same services originally provided by our NAEB Engineer. Within the past year, the Association has retained the engineering firm of Jansky and Bailey as consultants, and has had occasion to call upon it from time to time for assistance in matters of concern to the entire membership. However, it is impossible, for the retainer paid to Jansky and Bailey, to call upon them for assistance in serving individual stations. In general, therefore, the technical services of the Association have not provided the membership with the sort of advice and help which they most need.

VII Publicity and Public Relations — The regular NAEB publications, the Newsletter and the Journal, discussed in more detail under Item 4 (Member Services) also play a role in publicity and public relations. These publications go to people other than members, and the Journal is sent regularly to educational administrators across the country to keep them informed of developments in the educational broadcasting field. The NAEB Publications Editor is responsible for issuing press releases whenever anything of importance occurs within the Association. These press releases are sent to the wire services, principal newspapers across the country, the various trade publications, and radio and television columnists. In the field of public relations, perhaps the biggest effort is devoted to exhibits, both in our own meetings and at those of related organizations, such as the IERT, the

Speech Association convention, etc. At such meetings rather simple exhibits are displayed, and brochures and publications are provided so that those at the meeting may learn more about the Association and educational broadcasting. These efforts are limited by budget and staff. What is needed perhaps, is a full-scale public relations and publicity operation. At the present time, such an operation is not possible due to budgetary considerations.

In addition to the press releases previously mentioned, further publicity is obtained in connection with the holding of seminars, the granting of scholarships, and Grants-in-Aid, etc. In these instances, stories, prepared by the NAEB Publications Editor, are sent to local newspapers in the community where a Grant recipient, scholarship recipient or Seminar participant lives.

The NAEB public relations committee has recommended that efforts be made to procure funds which will permit the employment of a full time public relations director to devote his energies to such activities as the placement of stories promoting educational broadcasting in national publications, to arranging for better exhibits and materials at meetings of other organizations, to the preparation and distribution of new brochures and other promotional materials not now possible due to budgetary limitations, etc.

VIII Promotional Development and Activation — Activities in this area have been concentrated on a study to determine education's needs in the television spectrum and on efforts to encourage the enactment of legislation which would provide Federal funds to aid in the construction of new educational television stations. The Television Spectrum Study has been conducted under a contract with the United States Office of Education under the National Defense Education Act. The report of this Study is being prepared by Vernon Bronson and will assist the entire educational broadcasting movement as new stations are activated. In the area of Federal Aid to ETV legislation, the current picture is encouraging. The Magnuson Bill passed the Senate this past spring, and the House Sub-Committee on Communications and Power has recommended passage of a bill differing in many respects from the Magnuson Bill. This House Bill, it is anticipated, will have the full support of Oren Harris, Chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and should pass the Committee. It is further anticipated that the Bill will be passed this summer by the House of Representatives. Differences in the two bills will then be ironed out in a House-Senate conference committee, and at that time, the NAEB will endeavor to restore certain provisions from the original Roberts Bill. In addition to these activities, the staff, from time to time, is able to provide helpful information and materials to institutions and communities attempting to establish new radio and television stations. Our success in this venture is more evident in radio perhaps than in television. During the past year, several dozen requests for legal and engineering advice, as well as general advice, have been received from institutions planning FM radio stations. The general advice (suggestions for costs, staff, programs, station forms, etc.) has been provided without difficulty. In the case of legal and engineering advice, we have been able, often with the help of our legal and/or engineering consultants, to provide general information, and have indicated to the enquirer the need to employ legal and engineering assistance to get the station on the air.

IX Policy Guidance and Direction — This is perhaps the most nebulous "need" of educational broadcasters. Conditions differ so greatly in each situation that "hard and fast" advice is impossible, and there are no "rules" to follow. However, efforts are constantly made to render assistance in this area in the following ways: Specific times are allotted at seminars, national conventions, and regional meetings for discussion of problems related to guidance and direction; articles pertaining to the problem are carried in the Journal; the staff attempts to provide help when specific requests are received; NAEB committees deal with these matters in connection with other problems; etc.

This seminar might define this "need" more adequately and suggest ways in which it might be met.

X Financial Support — The most concrete assistance rendered in this area is the effort to assure the passage of legislation providing Federal aid to ETV construction, covered more thoroughly in Item 8, above.

The staff has offered limited advice, or has referred such matters to members able to assist, when inquiries of this nature have been received. Frankly, very little substantial assistance has been possible, and this seminar might suggest ways of improving service in this area. In addition, the seminar should consider the matter of firmer financial support for the Association itself.

XI International Relations — The NAEB has been quite active in international matters in recent years. Currently, under an ICA contract, we have a team of three specialists in the Sudan, assisting that nation to improve its broadcasting systems. Other such projects are being explored. Cooperation with the European Broadcasting Union and other international broadcasting agencies has improved, and the President of the NAEB recently represented the United States at two important international broadcasting conferences. These activities are of benefit to the entire movement as outlined under "Member Services," above.

Direct service to the membership (programs from other nations) is detailed in Item I (Programs). We maintain a file of educational broadcasters interested in overseas assignments (sabbaticals, etc.) and attempt to place interested persons in suitable positions.

XII Liaison with all Branches of Government — Congressional liaison has already been discussed. The NAEB also "keeps on top of" developments at the FCC and other agencies and informs the membership through the "Washington Report." We also file comments and petitions, on behalf of the membership, in matters pertaining to educational broadcasting, and appear at pertinent hearings.

The NAEB — In considering the above 12 "areas of need" (as well as others suggested at the time of the seminar), participants should consider not only the services which may be provided to educational broadcasters, but the needs of the Association itself as pointed out in the foregoing discussion.

Planning Committee — The committee given the responsibility of planning this seminar consists of: Vernon Bronson, Harry Skornia, Robert Blakeley, Edward Rosenheim, Jr., Keith Nighbert, Larry Frymire, and Harold Hill. The committee determined the general approach to the seminar, suggesting specific topics which might be considered, and selected the participants.

Following is a paper prepared by Vernon Bronson, Chairman, NAEB Professional Development Committee, to provide more background for the Seminar concerning Professional Development activities of the Association:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

1. Background

The Professional Development Committee (originally called the Professional Advancement Committee) was created as a standing committee when the NAEB was a trade association with a network service. Its purpose at that time was to determine and plan for such activities as would tend to increase the status of educational broadcasting, and the professional competence of the staffs of the member stations. When the NAEB revised its constitution and became a professional organization, as well as a trade association and a network, the purposes of the Professional Development Committee were expanded to include the general and specific needs of the individual members for professional growth, and, of the association for development of mass communication media as an integral part of the educational process. To these ends special funds were obtained, or monies allocated from general funds. Workshops and Seminars were planned and instituted; and training and study scholarships were awarded.

Since the first Allerton Seminar in 1949, the NAEB has held twenty-eight Seminars and Workshops. These might be categorized as follows:

Television Production - 9
Engineering - 5
Program Planning - 4
In-School Programs - 3
Utilization - 4
"Philosophical" - 3

During the same period, the NAEB has awarded ninety-six scholarships from funds granted the NAEB by the Ford Foundation, the FAE and the Blonder-Tongue Foundation for advanced study at regular college summer sessions or workshops and seminars run by colleges and universities.

As helpful as these activities were to the desired ends of professional development, they were considerably less than was needed to be done, especially in view of the rapidly growing membership potential of the NAEB, and the increasing significance of the profession in the general field of education. Through the years, the Committee recognized this, but was restricted and often frustrated in its efforts by lack of funds. No large grants were obtained for purposes of Professional Development, and few association funds could be used. During the past ten years, the period of our greatest development, only the following funds were available for Professional Development.

KELLOGG	
1951-52	$5000
1952-53	$5000
1953-54	$5500
1954-55	$3500
1955-56	$3000
1956-57	$3000
1957-58	$6000
1958-59	
1959-60	$6000
1960-61	$6000
1961-62	$6000*

FAE-FORD	
1953-54	$27,000
1954-55	$20,000
1955-56	$20,000
1956-57	$20,000
1957-58	$20,000

Since 1955 the Professional Development Commission has turned its efforts more and more to the development of professional standards-standards of performance, standards of training and qualifications, standards of operations, and standards of responsibility. Toward these ends and to establish a classification of the role of NAEB in the total development of educational broadcasting, the Professional Development Committee asked the Board of Directors to call a special Board meeting in conjunction with the chairmen of the standing committees. This meeting was held in Chicago in December 1957 following the St. Louis Convention. At the end of the three-day session there was general agreement that the major concern of NAEB should be the welfare and development of Educational Broadcasting and its professional personnel; and the Executive Committee was instructed to organize a meeting, in conjunction with the U.S. Office of Education, of all the interested and collateral organizations to accomplish the following objectives:

1. Establish a plan of inter-organizational cooperation and a workable division of responsibilities.

2. Develop a plan and procedure for determining and establishing professional standards in the field.

3. Establish a broad national plan to develop use of broadcast media in education.

The meeting was held in Washington early in 1958, but the agenda, procedure, and results had no resemblance to the originally prescribed objectives.

The next effort of the Professional Development Committee to move the NAEB toward its objectives resulted in a Committee Meeting in Chicago in December, 1959, in conjunction with a meeting of the Board of Directors. This Chicago meeting established some scholarships, enlarged the planned program for professional development, and laid down some specific procedures to raise necessary funds for professional activities.

As a follow-up on this meeting, Dr. Harry Skornia developed the idea and plan for a National Academy of Educational Broadcasting. This plan was comprehensive and detailed. It was first presented to the Kellogg Foundation and later to the Ford Foundation. Both of these organizations admitted its merit and need, but for policy and other reasons found they could not finance it. Part of the plan was then revised by the Committee to organize a survey and conduct a series of regional and national conferences to determine, evolve, and activate a body of professional criteria for training, operations and performance. This proposal was submitted to the U.S. Office of Education, under NDEA. The advisory committee and the staff approved the idea, but again for matters of policy it was rejected for a grant, but the Office suggested that it be revised and resubmitted. This has now been done, and a proposal is pending before the U.S.O.E. under NDEA for a grant to survey and inventory the professional personnel in Educational Broadcasting, hold regional and national conferences on professional standards, and plan a program of training through internships on all levels of operations and management. If the proposal is accepted and a grant made, the project will be developed under the auspices of the Professional Development Committee. It has been tentatively approved by the Advisory Committee of NDEA and the staff.

---

*Present Seminar

In the meantime, through the impetus of the plan for ETV proposed by Dr. John Burns, we are considering an up-dating of the National Academy plan or salient parts of it. Dr. Harry Skornia will discuss this at greater length for consideration of this seminar.

2. Problems

It seems to this Committee that one of the great needs, and one of the great responsibilities of the NAEB is to develop the general field of Educational Broadcasting into a profession. To do this it must establish a generally recognizable and recognized discipline, supported by a body of criteria, and practiced by a competent and organized membership. Such development will require a continuing complex of planned activities, projects, services and resources beyond that which is now available to the Association, and it will have to be based upon well-defined organizational concepts and directed by positive guide-lines.

To provide these requisites, the NAEB will have to clearly define its role in Educational Broadcasting; and it will also have to find a source or sources of financial support beyond any possible income from membership dues or service charges.

3. Suggestions

a. The NAEB should seek institutional membership representation from the administrative heads of such institutions.

b. The NAEB should publish a blue-book of professional personnel.

c. The NAEB should publish an expanded monthly journal or magazine which is self-supporting.

d. The NAEB should employ a Director of Resource Development to procure grants and continuing financial support.

e. The NAEB should up-date and modify the National Academy plan and make an effort to activate it section by section.

f. The NAEB should make every effort to activate the proposal for professional standards combined with a training program which is now pending before the U.S.O.E., if not through one source, then another.

g. The NAEB should expand its information and publications service into an institutional "Press" which publishes and distributes a wide-range of professional and educational literature.

h. A personnel counseling service, and a station activation consultation service, should be among the "firsts" of the Academy development.

i. The careful evaluation of the John Burns ETV development plan should be made in light of the NAEB's Spectrum Needs Survey Report and a carefully detailed schedule of procedure and development worked out and published, as a beginning instrument to activate this plan over the next 10 years.

j. A detailed proposal of support should be made to Burns and R.C.A., General Electric, Bell Telephone and others.

k. In everyway possible, a special effort should be made to establish proper working relationships with other organizations in the field and to define lines of demarcation of responsibility and service.

Ned Rosenheim, who was invited to attend this seminar, was unable to do so due to other commitments. However, he was kind enough to offer a couple of suggestions, in letter form, which he thought might be brought to the attention of the seminar. This letter is reproduced below.

Box 20
Pentwater, Michigan
July 11, 1961

Dear Harold,

One of the chief reasons I'm so disappointed at not being able to come to Madison is that I'm so damn grateful and flattered on this, as so many other occasions, to be invited to join NAEB's moguls in this undertaking. You are gratifying in your account of my quasi-outsider's opinions, and I do feel that one thing I would have said at Madison is worth setting down and shooting off to you; make of it whatever you want.

I've often told you — and doubtless bored you with — my concern that NAEB and educational broadcasting, generally enjoy greater and more sympathetic attention from the academic community, as well as the general "cultural" community (by which I mean professionals and devout amateurs in the arts, music, and institutions devoted to history, science and all the rest). I'm convinced we need strengthened participation in broadcasting from such quarters (as one example, I'm repeatedly shocked at Grants-in-aid sessions at proposals involving "talent" drawn patently from the opportunistic, the mediocre, the pedagogic buffoons, the drinking-fountain educationists, yet coming from places where I know the faculty includes men of great wisdom, charm and distinction who are never mentioned for broadcasting). We need vastly, greater awareness of NAEB and educational broadcasting as an authentic educational undertaking, in whose councils devoted scholars and teachers who are not necessarily communications experts or speech teachers or adult education specialists would be proud to take part. And we need — in Chicago at least — the cultivated person, academic or otherwise, to show up in the listening-viewing audience. The movement, in short, has not yet made proper contact with and use of the talent, the taste, and the professional devotion of thousands of professional people who could lend it vast strength.

I have, long before this, suggested that a deliberate campaign to increase individual membership in NAEB would be of great value. I've based this on my belief that the generic problems and activities and possibilities of the movement should and could be made of interest to responsible scholars and teachers whatever their "specialty." And I've suggested such piecemeal devices as urging that all members of faculty "advisory boards," which — if they're like that at U of C — are composed of a melange of non-broadcasting types from diversified disciplines, be urged to become individual members; I've suggested, too, that professors who broadcast more or less frequently (like our old Round Table regulars) would find it flattering to be invited to join the professional broadcaster's "union."

But at this point I think the greatest possibility for this kind of thing — and for advancement in prestige and influence on far broader fronts — lies in the JOURNAL. I am convinced that, without vast increases in publication costs, this publication can be made one of real appeal to a public whose interest in educational broadcasting is at present marginal at most. Of course the professor of botany or Greek or the director of the Art Institute or Historical Society will never become interested in a journal largely devoted to pieces on "Budgeting for 10 Watt FM Stations" or "Overcoming Micro-Wave Deviations by a 10XC Super-heterodyne Baffle" or "Minimizing Reading-Rate Differentials by Airborne TV Slip-cards." A diversity of specialized articles may grab the attention of a diversified handful of specialists — engineers, educationists, station managers — but it cannot, in its totality, command the enthusiasm of any single reader (NAEB faithful or not) and no part of it has the slightest appeal to the man of generalized intellectual curiosity.

If I were in charge of the JOURNAL I confess I would revolutionize nearly everything beginning with its title, which I'd change to something non-trade associationish (like EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING or even BROADCASTING or so help me, PUBLIC CHANNELS). I'd be entirely uninhibited about the direct relevance of what I published to NAEB news, views, and professional preoccupations. If there were scripts of sensational programs available, I'd publish them. I would run unabashed reviews of programs and series — educational and commercial. I would have articles, shamelessly partisan if need be, about FCC policy and channel allocation and the public good. I would, with only tenuous connection with, say, a current series as an excuse, be prepared to run things by topnotch folk on music or the pros and cons of the current Civil War promotion. And where something big in educational broadcasting was happening — say Airborne or BFA or the networks in the east — I would write them up in the most intelligible lively way so that they would be seen, not as a professional development described for an intramural audience, but as a national event, described to elicit the interest and excitement of the ordinary educated man. I would try for some verse, some humor. I would review books that bore only tangentially on broadcasting. I would counter the TV Guide kind of "Personality blurb" with responsible biographical treatment of people whose art and integrity had really helped shape broadcasting, whether educational or good commercial. I would certainly have a lot about current affairs, national and international, done from a broadcaster's slant or with a tie-in to some aspect of their broadcast coverage — if only, for example, to ask a network or other correspondent who was at the Summit, say, to write it up.

Is all this inappropriate? Mebbe so ... certainly it is if we stick to only one or two of the phases of our tripartite function. But as a professional association we can properly and invaluably produce more than a trade journal. This, like our broadcasts themselves, would be a national service. It would call for imagination, judgment, courage, and hard work — but all four of these are commodities which, my whole experience tells me, are in long supply with NAEB. Financing? I can't believe that initially much would be required that the present JOURNAL format couldn't include. Indeed, the shift in the kind of thing which were contained in the publication could, I should think, be effected without fanfare and with little additional expense.

I suppose I have THE LISTENER somewhat in mind. I'd like to see a less rarified and austere publication, but I envy that journal its audience. As it is, how many of NAEB's network listeners ever see its publication? Or would care if they did see it?

I hasten to say I'm not beefing about the present journal, for it's most competently and responsibly produced and does a good job of bringing interesting information to our devoted clan. But a publication of this sort does seem to me to offer a promise of such immensely increased influence, prestige, and membership (like National Geographic, the new Journal would require a tie-in individual membership or some special category of that kind) that I urge its consideration most soberly and devoutly. If the smallest twitch of interest comes of this, I'd be delighted to help wherever and however I can.

Every good wish for an immensely successful workshop. I shall, you may believe me, be thinking of you wistfully and devotedly.

Yours,

Ned